

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW

QUARTERLY

Vol. VII

APRIL, 1922

No. 2

EDITORIAL

A GOOD PIECE OF EXEGESIS IS OFTEN INSPIRING, WHILE a poor attempt may contribute nothing but uncertainty and confusion. However, such study is so valuable to the Bible student that he may well pay the price of early hazy results, if only he may at last come into a clearer and finer appreciation of the message conveyed by the text.

Every preacher should be able to read his Greek Testament and to enter intelligently into the problems of its translation. If wise, he will not do this to air his "learning" in the pulpit, but that he may increasingly come to think in the very literary atmosphere of the writers themselves and more deeply and broadly comprehend their thought. Now and then a persistent lover of the Greek text arrives at a point where he may well offer the results of his work to his fellow students, often with great profit.

Under the head, Our Lord "Confesses" His Father, a study of Matthew 11:25-26 and Luke 10:21-22, Dr. McPheeters gives us an example of the interpretative value and the stimulating effect of such scholarship. In our American Standard Version the more important Greek verbs of these passages have less specific and significant meanings than are assigned to them in this

study. The early portion of the paper is chiefly occupied with an examination of the equivalents offered by various translators for two verbs, more especially the one in Luke 10:21 rendered "thank" in the Revised Version and on which this discussion chiefly turns. Professor McPheeters regards "confess" as the rendering necessary to bring out the true meaning of this notable utterance of our Lord.

Then he proceeds to an examination of the context and circumstances to see if this meaning is justified. The latter part of the article develops the significance of Christ's utterance in the passages considered, as it shows His own attitude toward His Father's will, and thereby reveals acquiescence in the sovereign will of God as the soul's opportunity to escape its otherwise hopeless problems and to render its highest homage to God.

HAS THE CHURCH LOST ITS MESSAGE? CONFRONTED with the rationalistic element in some of its teaching to-day, with the innumerable schemes to attract people to its services, and with many of the sermon topics announced in the Saturday papers, one might almost ask whether the church really has a message for this age.

Neither the soul nor the laws of its life and growth change, and Christianity deals with the soul's fundamental and permanent concerns; hence its great message to men cannot vary. Christianity holds that knowledge of the soul's status and needs, and of the means for supplying them, comes from its Maker alone, by revelation. But, to judge from much said and written to-day the church is turning to human reason, as against divine revelation. We speak of modern ideas, methods, and progress as though the very structure of human nature had undergone a radical change in the last generation.

We hear of the new theology, the preaching for the times, the social gospel, and all the rest, as if the foundation laid in Christ had been outgrown, could no longer bear the superstructure of the highest human attainment, and so must be replaced.

It was inevitable that what is ordinarily connoted by the word evangelism would not escape the close scrutiny of the times. It is, therefore, most appropriate to have such an article as Dr. Goodell's, *The Evangelism for the Times*. The author's position gives him unusual opportunity to observe conditions and to study means for meeting them. He does not make the mistake of confining himself to the technique of evangelistic meetings and campaigns, a not unimportant question, but one depending largely upon particular personalities and local situations. Instead, he deals with the one sovereign remedy for sinful and suffering men and women, and with the church's duty to present it.

The church is not to pass on a mere tradition, but to make known a power that lays hold of the springs of life. The need of the new birth has not ceased to be felt; palliatives will not answer. The social gospel without spiritual life will not do; the Sermon on the Mount was not the climax in Christ's life, nor was physical healing, but the Cross.

The conditions that have confronted the church since the war are alluded to, but the central and ardently advocated theme is that the supreme duty—and the vital need—of the church in these times is to press her evangel more earnestly upon the attention of men.

THAT PERIOD WHICH SAW THE MIGHTY ROMAN EMPIRE crumbling and the once despised Christian church rising to a place of dominant power has rightly been a favorite

field of the historian. For here contended the great forces that enter into the molding of civilizations and the shaping of nations—religion, deep rooted customs, ancient laws, learning, military power, national pride, personal ambition, and the corroding power of wealth and luxury.

For some years Dr. E. G. Sihler has been developing the theme of the contact and conflict of classic paganism with Christianity in a series of notable articles that have attracted the most favorable attention of students of those times. In this issue appears the first part of the closing topic, Disintegration of the Roman Empire and Augustine's City of God. As in each case, the writer of these papers has devoted to the preparation of this one an extensive fresh examination of the sources, made in the light of a life time spent in the study of classic literature, history, and philosophy. Hence his utterances are those of an observer who is on old familiar ground, seeing for himself and not dependent on the accounts of others.

The present paper is chiefly concerned with affairs of the Empire in the latter part of the fourth and the early part of the fifth century, from the death of Theodosius to the sack of Rome by Alaric. In the chronicle of earth's affairs names, dates, places, and particular actions vary, but one is impressed with the melancholy persistence in high places of human weakness, vanity, hate, fear, jealousy, treachery, and violence—the sinister pack that howls on the trail of enfeebled nations. Here then is presented the secular side of the period, by way of preparation for a fuller appreciation of the treatment of Augustine's great work, to follow in another issue.

BY MANY STUDENTS PSYCHOLOGY IS NOW CALLED SIMPLY the science of behavior—of the responsiveness of consciousness to environment. The most trivial acts of everyday life are, therefore, subjects for analysis from the psychologist's standpoint; moreover, we are all constantly employing practical psychology when we observe the effect upon people of things, acts, and words.

Words alone afford a limitless field for such study. Yet in itself a word is a very limited thing. Beyond the simplest affirmations, language never fulfills the task we lay upon it; that is, it never fully mirrors for the mind of another the impressions made upon one's own. If one says he saw the sunrise this morning, he expresses a simple fact that appeals merely to our elemental consciousness. But if he tries to describe the glory of the sunrise, he knows that no words can convey the sublime impression the scene made upon him.

No human mind can fully express a lofty or important conception. It is as though each soul were condemned to partial solitude, communion between the most intimate never being really complete. One wonders whether in the hereafter by some mystic language souls may find their utmost revelation—their full companionship.

In his paper, *The Written Word*, Dr. Snowden shows the immensely important place words hold in our lives, calls rapidly to view various phases of their nature and use, and then takes up their capacities and limitations as concerned in the production and understanding of the Scriptures. Here the problem of inspiration inevitably emerges, and it is treated in a sound manner. A vast amount of controversy might have been, and could be, avoided, by heeding such a word of caution as is here given. When once the general principle is

accepted, it is unwise to attempt full and exact definition of processes, for at once divergent views begin to clash.

The very limitation of words, even when employed as the medium of the divine message, is shown to be an advantage, in that it necessitates the deepest study. The necessity of a Bible—a written Word—and of scholarship to deal with it is taken up, and it is pointed out here again, as by so many students of the subject, that the Bible has come out of the past century of keenest criticism sound and triumphant.

A FAILURE IS A MELANCHOLY SUBJECT FOR DISCUSSION. One can have little enthusiasm when engaged in the dissection of a merely negative life; how much worse when the life is such that it becomes an example of moral disaster. Judas is not an attractive subject. But the Scriptures include some account of him and his appalling descent from a position of the most glorious opportunity to that of the greatest—and the cheapest—traitor in history, so his record requires consideration. The chief purpose of such a study is to warn against the cultivation of those tendencies that prepare the heart for some supreme temptation.

It is not to be supposed that Dr. Robertson preferred to write upon Judas, the Minister Who Betrayed His Lord, rather than upon one of the many other Scripture studies that offer; but the career of this man is the source of much question and speculation, and this paper is an effort to place the whole case before us in brief form.

We have here, then, the estimate of the offense of Judas, as men have given it, a brief resumé of the theories put forward to account for his act, Christ's own attitude toward him, and then, at more length, a discus-

sion of the elements in the character of Judas that led to his downfall. Chiefly noted are, ambition, jealousy, resentment, and covetousness.

Of necessity the few glimpses we have of Judas' life and acts leave certain things to conjecture, and the present treatment of the subject indulges in it freely to complete the picture. But it is conjecture based on human nature and experience. The story is not without its solemn reminder of the possibilities of courting and playing with selfish propensities, even on the part of the minister, and this fact is not overlooked here.

HUMAN AFFAIRS IN SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE CONTINUE in a volcanic state, continually threatening a further eruption. The spirit of immense desire for better conditions, religiously, economically, politically, educationally, pervades the life of that region. Conflicting as reports are, on many points, we are assured by accounts in general that there is great physical suffering, great mental stress, and great spiritual hunger.

A few months ago Mr. Robert P. Wilder, of the Student Volunteer Movement, made an extensive tour through the countries of that part of the Old World, not only observing general conditions, but ministering to spiritual and moral need, and thereby coming in contact with the attitude of individuals, especially members of the student class. We are given the results in his vivid pen picture called simply, from the territory involved, **Southeastern Europe**.

He first gives the situation—the fear, jealousy, and hostility that stamp all international relations, with the resultant military burdens and economic disturbance; then the spiritual and mental state of the people; and finally a plain statement of our duty to these long

harassed brothers of ours who appeal for love and sympathy even more than for material help.

Especially significant is the yearning of these people for spiritual truth, as shown by Mr. Wilder's many public meetings and private interviews. His apologetic arguments, as outlined here, are of special interest. There is now a great religious ferment, but what the outcome is to be may be largely due to the response of Christian America to just such appeals as this, made by a fully competent observer of many years' experience. Shall Southeastern Europe sink back into religious formalism and inertia, or will those peoples be helped by us into the full light of the Gospel, as we awaken to this surpassing opportunity?

R. M. K.

OUR LORD "CONFESSES" HIS FATHER

Matthew 11:25-26; Luke 10:21-22

By PROFESSOR WILLIAM M. MCPHEETERS, Columbia Theological Seminary

UNQUESTIONABLY *Ἐξομολογῶμαι* is the key word in this classical passage. A detailed examination of the history of its interpretation lies outside the scope of the present paper; the same is true of the harmonistic questions that have been raised in connection with the narratives in Matthew and Luke. A brief statement by Dr. Broadus, in his admirable Commentary on Matthew, will sufficiently summarize what is essential in the history of the interpretation of this verb; and that the sequence of events as given by Luke is historical and in harmony with that found in Matthew will be assumed.

Dr. Broadus, then, correctly says that, as renderings of *ἐξομολογοῦμαι*: "The early and later English versions are about equally divided between 'praise' and 'thank.'" To this statement it will be enough to add that even where commentators depart from these renderings—as many of the best of them do—they are still careful to insist that ideas of "praise" and "thanksgiving" are present as subauditions in their proposed substitutes. Such, for the purposes of this discussion, is a sufficient statement of the facts of the history of the interpretation of the key word in this memorable utterance of our Lord.

That this rendering should have been so long practically unchallenged is remarkable. The difficulties presented by it will be found to begin—though by no means

to end—as soon as we frankly face the meaning that it imparts to our Lord's words as a whole. What this meaning is Dr. Broadus himself shall tell us. "The idea," he says, "seems to be, 'I fully recognize the propriety of thy course, I rejoice over it (consult Luke 10: 21) and praise thee for it.'" Again, this time commenting on the words, "Even so, Father," and expressing himself, if that were possible, even more plainly and pungently, Dr. Broadus paraphrases thus: "'Yea, Father (I thank and praise thee) that so it was well-pleasing in thy sight.'" Notice that this is not as often quoted, an expression of mere resignation. Our Lord acknowledges the propriety of God's sovereign course, and praises Him for it. Whatever pleases God ought to please us." It will be seen that unlike some other commentators—and I may add some very excellent ones—Dr. Broadus does not gloss matters. "What pleases God," he says, and says truly, "ought to please us," and did please Jesus. God finds pleasure, it seems, in hiding from the wise and understanding and revealing only unto babes the things pertaining to their peace; and Jesus rejoices, and thanks and praises Him for so doing. As evidencing piety and fearless loyalty to what one conceives to be the meaning of Scripture this is splendid, but it is not exegesis. As in the case of the "Light Brigade," so here we may be sure that someone has blundered. For, that we might have "strong encouragement" when confronted with the most perplexing problem of His moral government, "seeing that he could swear by none greater," God has been pleased to swear by Himself saying, "As I live saith Jehovah, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked."

Happily, certain of the defects of the exegesis of Dr. Broadus lie, as it were, upon the surface. Thus,

for example, he treats the familiar phrase, "well-pleasing in thy sight," as though it meant pleases thee. Of course, it means nothing of the kind. The phrase has a purely technical significance. To say of anything that it is "well-pleasing in thy sight" means, not that it is something that produces in the divine bosom the emotional reaction designated by the word pleasure, but that it is something which approves itself to the divine wisdom as the thing which, under all the circumstances, ought to be done, as the thing which accords best with God's "vast designs," and that without regard to whether the primary effect of doing it will be to produce either in His bosom or in that of His creatures the emotion of pleasure or the reverse. God does not administer affairs upon eudaemonistic principles. "He doth not willingly afflict the children of men," but nevertheless He afflicts them. His acts are determined by His wisdom, and not by the primary emotional reactions that will follow them. Again the jealousy of Dr. Broadus for a spontaneous, and even spectacular, accord between the will of Jesus and that of His Father has precipitated him into attributing to our Lord emotions not only unnatural, but morally repellent emotions that are wholly foreign alike to His Father and to Himself. The same jealousy has hidden from his eyes the fact that as great moral splendor may attach—I will not say to "mere resignation" to the will of God, but—to a hardly achieved acquiescence in the will of God as can attach to even the most spontaneous accord with that will. But we need not dwell at length here upon these matters.

But for the fundamental explanation, both of the exposition of Dr. Broadus, and of the vitality of the traditional rendering of *ἐξομολογοῦμαι*, we must turn now

to Luke 10:21. To that passage Dr. Broadus has himself referred us.

As it stands in the version of 1611, and in the Greek text lying behind that version, it reads: "In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father," etc. This being the fuller and clearer passage has naturally determined the exegesis of Matthew 11:25. Obviously, if we are tied to "rejoiced" as the one and necessary meaning of ἡγαλλιάσατο, then, painful or not, exceptional and startling or not, we have no option but to recognize the fact that it is here unequivocally said that the words spoken by Jesus were but the vocal expression of the joy that filled His spirit as He uttered them. Fortunately such is not the case. On the contrary this verb is as little tied to the meaning rejoice, as ἐξομολογῶμαι is to the meaning "thank" or praise.

Commenting on Matthew 10:25, Dr. J. A. Alexander calls attention to the fact that in Matthew 3:6, and "usually elsewhere," ἐξομολογῶμαι is rendered "confess." And a glance at any good Greek lexicon will show that the primary idea expressed by ἀγαλλιάω is that of exalted and pleasurable emotion. Exult is one rendering given both by Thayer and Young. Triumph would be equally appropriate as a rendering. Triumph differs from "rejoice" in that it implies opposition successfully encountered, conflict issuing in victory. Certainly the reasonable soul is susceptible of few, if any, more exalted and pleasurable emotions than that elicited by the consciousness of having overcome in a conflict that threatened its moral integrity with irretrievable ruin. Based upon a better Greek text than that of the version of 1611, the translation of Luke 10:21 in the versions of 1881 and 1900 strongly suggests

that the Evangelist is here recording the outcome of an experience similar to that through which our Lord was called to pass but a little while later in Gethsemane. It reads: "In that same hour he rejoiced by [margin] the Holy Spirit, and said," etc. Here both the phrase "in that same hour" and the phrase "by the Holy Spirit" are clearly and highly significant. The former phrase unambiguously implies that there was something singularly untoward in the circumstances by which Jesus then found Himself confronted. The latter phrase with as little ambiguity implies that so very untoward were these circumstances that it was only by an access of moral and spiritual strength graciously imparted by the Holy Spirit Himself that our Lord was enabled to utter the words that immediately follow.

Nor are we left to conjecture as to what it was in the circumstances confronting Him that bore so grievously upon our Lord's spirit. He Himself signalizes it for us in the words, "thou hast hidden these things"—that is, of course, the things pertaining to their peace—"from the wise and understanding, and hast revealed them unto babes." Hence what the Holy Spirit graciously enabled Jesus to do was to see in this hiding from the wise and understanding and revealing only to "babes" the things pertaining to their salvation an expression of "the absolute and sovereign will of God," and with unabated filial confidence to acquiesce in it as such. For clearly it is in the words, "Even so, Father: for so it was well-pleasing in thy sight," that this sublime utterance of our Lord reached its climax. The words "by the Holy Spirit" are without point, except as they signalize the extreme, the intolerable, bitterness of the conflict through which our Lord's spirit was passing "in that same hour." And they give us also the

true measure of the moral and spiritual majesty of His achieved acquiescence in this particular expression of "the absolute and sovereign will" of His Father.

With the true text of Luke 10:21 before us, therefore, no one can fail to perceive the incongruity of rendering ἡγαλλιάσατο "rejoiced" and ἐξομολογοῦμαι "thank" or "praise." Not only so, but the context also, both that which precedes and that which follows, protests against so rendering either verb.

In Matthew the "woes" or "alas's" pronounced by Jesus immediately precede, and are by the Evangelist himself formally and expressly connected with, His address to His Father. And in Luke the connection between the "alas's" and the address, while less immediate and less formal, is not a whit less real and intimate. But we know certainly that neither to Jesus nor His Father is the doom of the impenitent a matter of rejoicing. Nor is the rendering, "Jesus rejoiced * * * and said, I thank thee," less repugnant to the context that follows. To suppose that an emotional experience that began in rejoicing, praise, and thanksgiving, in the very next breath issued—to use Dr. Broadus' unduly depreciatory phrase—in "mere resignation" is worse than an anticlimax. It is incongruous and unnatural. Further, the protest of Matthew 11:26 (Luke 10:22) is re-enforced by that of Matthew 11:27 (Luke 10:23), "All things have been delivered unto me," etc. Matthew 11:27 was added by Jesus, so Dr. J. A. Alexander tells us, "to prevent all misconception of his own authority." This is intelligible enough on the assumption that, in the circumstances confronting our Lord, and in the antithesis between His own and His Father's will implicit in the words, "Even so, Father; for so it was well-pleasing in thy sight,"

there was that which created an appearance of lack of harmony between Himself and His Father. But otherwise this calm assertion of comprehensive fundamental harmony and intimate and pervasive co-operation between Himself and His Father has the appearance of being a theologumenon, and a theologumenon for the presence of which there is neither justification nor explanation. And so of Matthew 11:28-30. If by "my yoke" Jesus means a yoke that He Himself is even then wearing, a yoke that marks His own subjection to His Father, all becomes clear. That yoke does not gall Him, neither will it gall them, if like Him they "are meek and lowly in heart"; through Him they also can achieve acquiescence in "the absolute and sovereign will of God," an achievement possible only for those who have caught His filial spirit. But once we let go this clue furnished us by the context, then these words of our Lord, beautiful and appealing as they are, become a labyrinth in which we lose ourselves. All references to the yoke of the law merely add to our confusion. Thus we see that the context shuts us up, as it were, to find for *ἡγαλλιάσατο* some other translation than "rejoiced," and for *ἐξομολογούμεναι* some other than "praise" or "thank."

If, now, for "rejoiced" in the traditional rendering of Luke 10:21 (Matt. 11:25), we substitute triumphed, and for "I thank" we substitute I confess, we will find that all of our difficulties disappear. The passage will then read: "In that very hour he triumphed by the Holy Spirit, and said, I confess thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, for thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding and didst reveal them unto babes."

The first and most obvious effect of this rendering will be that the words of Jesus here immediately relate

themselves to the theme that Matthew has been unfolding in the preceding context. That context extends as far back as the beginning of chapter 10, and from 10:24 on its main theme may be said to be confession. Further, not only is confession the theme of this larger context, but the implications of this pregnant term, as disclosed by this context, are just those needed to bring our Lord's address to His Father (Matt. 11:25-26) into vital harmony both with its own immediate, and with this larger context of which His address forms an integral part. What these implications are it behooves us to notice, both because the circumstances of our own time tend mightily to obscure them, and especially because it is only as we have them clearly before us that we can fully appreciate our Lord's confession of His Father. Obviously, as here used, confession is the acknowledgment of the validity of certain claims, and an acceptance of the relations and obligations involved in them. To confess Christ, for example, is to admit the validity of His claims to be our Saviour and our Lord, and to affirm our acceptance of and our reliance upon Him as such, and our allegiance and obligations to Him in both of these characters. So far all is plain and familiar enough.

Further, it is easy to see that confession always implies a challenge. This challenge may be explicit or merely implicit. It may amount to nothing more than the challenge always inherent in any and all claims simply as such; or it may be accentuated by the fact that the claims to which confession is the response are either generally ignored or denied. Frequently the mere course of events is itself the most crucial of all challenges. This is always the case when, had the claims been well founded, we would have reason to expect that the course

of events would have been different from what we find it actually to be. Today the challenge to which confession of Christ is the answer is ordinarily so veiled and so vague as to obscure rather than to reveal the extent of the reliance and the quality of the loyalty demanded by Jesus of His disciples.

And it is just here that the larger context we are considering comes to our help. In Matthew 10:24-33 the extent of this reliance and the quality of this loyalty stand out as under a search-light. In that passage Jesus frankly forewarns His disciples that a time would come in their personal experience, when events would apparently give the lie to His claim; a time when, at least to the eye of what men mistakenly call "cold reason," there would be absolutely nothing to warrant the confidence that He had invited from them, and that they had accorded Him; a time when discipleship, so far from wearing the face of a privilege, would have become a source of peril and disaster. He forewarns them that that coming hour would seem to sound not only in Nature's, but in Reason's ear the call, "Every man for himself," cancelling all obligation in favor of the so-called primary obligation of self-preservation, and would seem to justify the call by apparently convincing evidence that He, Jesus, Himself had, on His part, failed to make good His claims, and to live up to His character. And to fore-arm them against the exigent peril of that hour our Lord further earnestly impresses it upon His disciples that the only confession of Himself by them that, in the day decisive for their final destiny, will elicit from Him an answering confession of them will be a confession that will sustain and survive the tremendous shock to which the quality of their loyalty to Himself and their confidence in His loyalty to them

were thus to be subjected by the facts of their own personal experience. Thus Jesus Himself makes the magnitude of the challenge with which His claims are to be confronted at once the test and the measure of the worth of a confession of Himself as Saviour and Lord.

The Evangelist next immediately proceeds to show by two concrete instances that the quality of our Lord's loyalty was itself subjected to a test of like rigor. Nothing inspires loyalty like loyalty. And doubtless it is to hearten disciples of every age in the hour of their trial, that we have in Matthew 11:7-11 the record of our Lord's confession of John the Baptist. It was well suited at once to illustrate and to justify the kind of loyalty that Jesus claimed for Himself. In John's case the course of events seemed to have discredited both his claims and his testimony. The brief hour of his popularity was now past. The Baptist lay a prisoner in Herod's dungeon. To maintain the divine authority of John's character as a prophet was to invite Herod's enmity. The mission from John that had just waited upon Jesus with their master's question: "Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?" was little less than a challenge of our Lord's loyalty to His hardly bestead disciple, and subjected John himself to the suspicion of being "a reed shaken by the wind." Such were the circumstances under which Jesus evidenced His loyalty to His disciple, and, by pronouncing upon him His great encomium, confessed him before men.

Then, the "alas's" upon Bethsaida, Chorazin, and Capernaum intervening, in Matthew 11:25-30, the Evangelist records Jesus' confession of His Father, the comment by which He safeguarded it from misconception, and the tender appeal to His disciples that He based upon it. One purpose, perhaps the primary pur-

pose of the record here, as in that of our Lord's confession of the Baptist, was, we may be sure, to hearten His disciples for their confession of Himself. How could He more effectually do this than by evidencing His own loyalty to His Father, and His confidence in His Father's loyalty to Himself under circumstances that would test the reality and the quality of that loyalty and confidence quite as severely as the reality and quality of their loyalty to Himself were to be tested? His own example would forever answer the otherwise not unplausible objection that the character of the loyalty and confidence in Himself that He had demanded of His disciples was unreasonable and impossible. It henceforth stands as an abiding assurance to the reasonable soul that, without discarding its character as a reasonable soul, it can accept the utmost test to which its loyalty to Jesus and its confidence in His loyalty to itself can possibly be put by the course of events; it stands as an abiding assurance that, come what may, the soul can still rationally hold fast its confidence in God, both as Father and as Lord of Heaven and earth. It would henceforth base an immutable rational conviction that no events lie outside the control of Him who is Lord of Heaven and earth, and that all events, even those most baffling to reason and most bitter to be borne, would ultimately be found to be in harmony with God's perfections and with His paternal love.

This view, namely, that one purpose of our Lord's open and public confession of His Father, and especially of the record of this confession, was to hearten His disciples, explains the stress laid by both Matthew and Luke upon the circumstances under which His confession was made. The former says: "At that juncture, Jesus answered and said," thus, as Dr. Broadus points out,

formally connecting our Lord's confession of His Father with His "alas's" upon Bethsaida and its sister cities, and so admonishing his readers that, if they wish adequately to understand the confession of Jesus, they must view it in the light of the challenge of the circumstances to which it was in effect an "answer."

Luke's language is even more arresting. "In that very hour," it reads, "he triumphed by the Holy Spirit, and said." The words, "In that very hour," of themselves remind us that our Lord's confession of His Father derives its chief significance from the circumstances confronting Him at the time. But it is the added statement, "he triumphed by the Holy Spirit," that is most pregnant with suggestion. They imply that such was the character of these circumstances that, but for the timely and gracious succor of the Holy Spirit, they might well have fatally obscured from our Lord's vision either the paternal love of His Father or His Father's lordship of Heaven and earth, or both. Lordship of Heaven and earth means, of course, the sufficiency of His Father's wisdom and power to control and shape to His own ends all events. Let us, then, now proceed to examine our Lord's confession itself and the circumstances that gave it its significance and its worth.

"I confess thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, for thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes. Even so, Father, for so it was well-pleasing in thy sight." Such is our Lord's confession. It is immediately followed by the words: "All things have been delivered unto me of my Father; and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to

reveal him." These words, addressed to His disciples, are a calm and sublime affirmation by our Lord of the fundamental accord and co-operation obtaining between Himself and His Father. That they were spoken proves that they were not uncalled for. They were primarily designed to safeguard His disciples against any misconstruction of the antithesis between His own and His Father's will implied in His confession itself. That antithesis in its turn must have arrested the attention of His disciples, and emphasized the fact that the course of events evidenced, at least to all appearances, a disastrous lack of harmony of purpose and action between Jesus and Him whose Son and Servant He claimed to be. Looking deeper for a moment, it may well be that it was by bringing vividly to consciousness in our Lord's reasonable soul and vitalizing the great truths embodied in this profound utterance that the Holy Spirit succored Jesus and enabled Him to "triumph" "in that very hour." If so, in giving expression to these truths Jesus, like Paul, comforted His disciples with the comfort wherewith He had Himself been comforted by the Holy Spirit. Certainly they provided a soil in which a sane optimism might root itself, and from which it could derive deathless vitality.

The words, "Even so, Father: for so it was well-pleasing in thy sight," with which our Lord His confession closes, and to which His solemn utterance that we have just been considering immediately attaches itself, will serve as our best approach to a consideration of the confession proper. As already stated, these words are an expression of our Lord's "acquiescence in the absolute and sovereign will of God." The fundamental notion of the word "acquiescence" is merely that

of the acceptance of the will of another. Such acceptance may be unforced or forced, reasoned or unreasoned. Its ethical quality may be neutral, ignoble, or noble and ennobling. Which of these it will actually be will depend upon the nature of that which is accepted, and the motive determining the acceptance. Of course, when, due to mere mental and moral inertia, there is nothing admirable in acquiescence in the will of another. And where such acquiescence arises from cowardice or mere regard for one's own selfish interests it is positively degrading. On the other hand, the acquiescence that is determined by worthy, rational, and moral considerations does honor at once to him to whom and to him by whom it is accorded. In this case one measure of the worth and moral grandeur of acquiescence will be the cost at which it is accorded. This leads me to say that the reasonable soul can render no loftier, worthier homage to God, nor can it perform an act worthier of or more ennobling to itself than to acquiesce in "the absolute and sovereign will of God." That this is no exaggeration will become obvious as soon as we pause to permit the meaning of this pregnant, this portentous phrase to unfold itself before our minds.

"The absolute and sovereign will of God." The mere words themselves fill the reasonable soul with solemn awe. Intelligently used, they are to it a crucial reminder of its limitations, of its insufficiency to itself, of the fact that it exists by, at, and for the will of Another, and He one whose "judgments are unsearchable and his ways past finding out." Unreasonable souls they fill with impotent rage and bitter scorn. Such souls deride "the absolute and sovereign will of God" as a mere lying euphemism, employed by pious weaklings as an anodyne to ease their anguish when omnipo-

tent caprice is cruelly mocking and sporting with their human helplessness. To refer events to "the absolute and sovereign will of God" is but an indirect way of saying that they are events that do not carry their explanation or justification upon their face, and for which reason can find none. That is to say, they are events the wisdom, justice or goodness of which is not discernible by human reason. Such events baffle reason and dismay conscience. The dilemma that they create for the reasonable soul is as obvious as it is poignant. To refuse to refer events of this character to the will of God is to deny that God's will is really sovereign, or, to state it differently, is to deny that God is in any real sense "Lord of heaven and earth." And to do this is to leave both the soul and God in the unbreakable grip of omnipotent caprice. On the other hand, to refer such events to God is apparently to deny God's paternal love and care, if not indeed to transform God Himself into malevolent caprice, or else it is to pronounce human reason and conscience an inadequate and useless equipment. But obviously any of these views spells despair; any of them turns the universe into a moral mad-house, and brands man's boasted rational and moral powers as a mere species of megalomania. No wonder, then, that such events create a crisis for the reasonable soul. Much more is this true, when, as here in the case of our Lord, "the sovereign and absolute will of God," no longer a matter merely to philosophize about, comes stark between the soul and the whole thrust and drive of its most cherished desires and worthiest and most strenuous efforts, and their intended goal. Such experiences constitute for the reasonable soul the supreme test both of the rationality and the reality of its confidence in God as "Father," and as "Lord of heaven and earth."

But, paradoxical as it may sound, while such experiences create for the soul its sorest dilemma, they also provide it with its noblest opportunity. To escape its dilemma and to grasp its opportunity the reasonable soul has only to accept in a filial spirit the yoke of its creaturely limitations, and to recognize the fact that even when clouds and darkness are round about it, righteousness and judgment are still the foundation of God's throne. Than such acquiescence in His will, as at once sovereign and likewise paternal, the reasonable soul can render no loftier homage to God; nor is it capable of any nobler or more ennobling assertion of its confidence in the integrity of its own rational and moral powers. This, then, was the homage that Jesus offered His Father in saying: "Even so Father; for so it was well-pleasing in thy sight."

But if we wish to know the greatness of our Lord's triumph, the splendor and worth of His confession as an act of filial homage to His Father, we must proceed to inquire what precisely was "the absolute and sovereign will of God" in which, in this instance, Jesus acquiesced, and what His acquiescence cost Him. What it was in which He acquiesced we learn from the words to which His acquiescence immediately attaches itself, "for thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding and didst reveal them unto babes." What this meant for Jesus we shall best learn by noting in some detail the circumstances confronting Jesus when He spoke these words and the situation that He sums up in them.

Speaking generally, then, our Lord's great confession was made when "the things concerning" Him were hastening to their end. His Galilean ministry, punctuated by His visits to Jerusalem at the Passovers

and other yearly feasts, lay behind Him; and the close of His ministry as whole, now so near, lay clearly in view. Its course and its outcome, both for Himself and for those whom He had come not to condemn, but to save, could now be fully appraised. It is a dull ear that fails to catch the hints dropped by the evangelists that show how thoroughly this matter of the outcome of His ministry, in both of its aspects, had for some time been engaging the thoughts of Jesus. The question addressed to the disciples at Caesarea Philippi: "Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?" indicates our Lord's interest in the kind of reception men were giving to His claims. How far this was from being to Him a matter of small concern is apparent from the question: "Whereunto shall I liken the men of this generation?" It reminds one of the question put by Jehovah to Israel: "What more could I have done unto my vineyard than I have done unto it?" That He was profoundly stirred at the thought of what was in prospect for Himself is no less evident. If His soul did not shrink from that prospect, what meaning is there in the statement that, "he set his face steadfastly to go up to Jerusalem"? Or how can we explain the fact that, as "they were on the way, going up to Jerusalem," Jesus' bearing was such that His disciples "were amazed," and that as they followed Him they "were afraid"? Evidently the mind of Jesus was busy, painfully busy, with the outcome of His ministry.

But the immediate occasion of our Lord's confession was the return of the seventy and their report on the outcome of their ministry (Luke 10:17-20). The striking thing about the record here is the not unnatural, but too easy and ill-grounded, optimism of the seventy, and our Lord's failure to fall in with it. He does

indeed see in their favorable report a forecast of the final triumph of His own mission, but their success creates no illusions for Him. Indeed, the very naïvete of their irrepressible elation, not unmingled apparently with a certain sense of self-importance and self-sufficiency, only served to bring home to Him vividly and painfully their immaturity. And their "stony ground" optimism, quick to spring up and, because it derived its entire vitality from the shallow soil of temporary success, destined soon to perish, served but to cause the outcome of His own mission, so tragic both for Himself and for others, to press with the more poignant bitterness upon His own heart. For His "alas's" upon Bethsaida, Chorazin, and Capernaum are still warm upon His lips and weighing heavily upon His spirit.

Now, perhaps, we are in a position better to understand what is implied in Luke's words: "In that very hour he triumphed by the Holy Spirit, and said, I confess thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth: for thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes. Even so, Father." Hidden "from the wise and understanding" and revealed only to "babes," such is our Lord's summing up of the outcome of His ministry as a whole. How sharp, how painful the contrast between what it ought to have been and what it actually was. On any other lips such language, uttered under such circumstances, would be the very essence of caustic irony, chagrined defeat, cynical, self-mocking despair. But here as elsewhere our Lord's words are untainted either by chagrin, cynicism, or despair. No doubt, His applying the term "babes" to His disciples does indicate that He recognized and even felt keenly their limitations, both absolute and relative. But to find in it an expression

of cynical contempt, either for them or for the fruitlessness and bootlessness of His ministry as represented in them, would be worse than gratuitous. On the contrary, on our Lord's lips the term "babes" here implies rather the gracious, tender, affectionate, sheltering interest that His insight into their limitations awakened in His bosom for His disciples. Further, that His words are not a veiled outburst of chagrined defeat and despair, is evidenced by our Lord's calm and sweeping assertion: "All things have been delivered unto me of my Father." Such language breathes the assured conviction that, all appearances to the contrary notwithstanding, both the past and the future belonged in reality to Himself.

At the same time, we should not shut our ears to the natural, nay—unless we strip them of all their proper significance and force—the necessary implications of the sharp and pregnant contrast embedded in the words, "thou hast hidden these things from the wise and understanding, and hast revealed them unto babes." For if no taint of cynical self-mockery attaches to the latter term, just as little does any taint of cynical irony attach to the former. To assume that His rejection by the "wise and understanding" was a matter of indifference to our Lord is simply to denaturalize Him, to deny to Him the possession of "a reasonable soul." Certainly wisdom and understanding of themselves constitute no bar sinister, explaining why "these things" were hidden from those possessing these high endowments. For high endowments they are. Everywhere in God's Word they are declared to be among His best and most to be coveted gifts. Everywhere they are represented as among the brightest and most priceless ornaments of the soul made in the likeness of God, "only wise." Our wisdom, therefore, will be to accept without the least dimi-

nution the natural implications of our Lord's own terse summing up of the visible outcome of His ministry and mission—"hidden from the wise and understanding," revealed only "unto babes"—and frankly to recognize the poignant surprise and regret and the heart-breaking disappointment with which it is resonant.

On any other interpretation of His words our Lord's ministry becomes an insoluble riddle, and He Himself a psychological and ethical enigma, His "reasonable soul" a docetic delusion. How, for example, are we to explain to ourselves the "mighty works" done in Bethsaida, Chorazin, and Capernaum, the Galilean centers of Jewish culture, the home and gathering place of the "wise and understanding," or the "alas's" based upon them, unless these "mighty works" were done with the desire and design of actually commending our Lord and His claims to the minds, the hearts, and the consciences of the "wise and understanding"? "More tolerable," He exclaims, "for Tyre and Sidon in the judgment" than for Bethsaida and Chorazin, "more tolerable for the land of Sodom" than for Capernaum. Our ears tingle, our minds are confounded, and our hearts stand aghast before the abysmal misery implied in the terrible energy of such a contrast. Are we, then, to suppose that the heart of Him who uttered this appalling "Alas" felt no anguish at the thought that the doom He pronounced was but the inevitable moral recoil of the failure of these Galilean cities to make proper response to His tireless efforts to avert from them just such a doom? The mere thought itself is monstrous.

We pay but poor tribute to our Lord's Deity, or to our own confidence in it, by denying to His humanity its most obvious and fundamental rights and stripping it of its noblest characteristics. He had given three

years of unparalleled activity to His Galilean ministry. He had mingled day after day with "the wise and understanding" on their streets and in their market places; He had preached to them in the synagogue and on the hill-side; He had been accorded a place at their festivities and at their funerals; as a guest in their homes He had reclined at their tables and eaten their salt; He had taken their tots upon His knee, and pressed their heads to His bosom; He had healed their sick, and comforted their mourners; days of labor among them had been followed by nights of prayer; He had stirred their hearts to the depths and filled them with wonder at "the gracious words that proceeded out of his lips"; He had seen the multitudes of Galilee swept by enthusiasm—unintelligent and unspiritual, it is true, but still genuine enthusiasm—until they were ready to take Him by force and make Him their king; He had seen their hunger and had had compassion on them, their sicknesses and griefs and had been moved with compassion for them, their spiritual desolations and destitutions and had been stirred with compassion for them; and now, as the curtain falls upon the tragedy of His Galilean ministry, His grief breaks forth in this solemn, this dreadful "Alas for thee, Chorazin! Alas for thee, Bethsaida!"

And yet we hesitate to admit to ourselves that His understanding was perplexed and baffled, His heart burdened with disappointment and anguish by this "mysterious failure of His public ministry!" Well, we need not. Long before this time the prophet Isaiah, when he foresaw His labors and their meager results, had foretold that the Servant of Jehovah in the bitterness of His soul would exclaim: "I have labored in vain, and spent my strength for naught and vanity." We see Jesus as with this "mysterious failure" behind Him

MS. A. 9. 2. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100. 101. 102. 103. 104. 105. 106. 107. 108. 109. 110. 111. 112. 113. 114. 115. 116. 117. 118. 119. 120. 121. 122. 123. 124. 125. 126. 127. 128. 129. 130. 131. 132. 133. 134. 135. 136. 137. 138. 139. 140. 141. 142. 143. 144. 145. 146. 147. 148. 149. 150. 151. 152. 153. 154. 155. 156. 157. 158. 159. 160. 161. 162. 163. 164. 165. 166. 167. 168. 169. 170. 171. 172. 173. 174. 175. 176. 177. 178. 179. 180. 181. 182. 183. 184. 185. 186. 187. 188. 189. 190. 191. 192. 193. 194. 195. 196. 197. 198. 199. 200. 201. 202. 203. 204. 205. 206. 207. 208. 209. 210. 211. 212. 213. 214. 215. 216. 217. 218. 219. 220. 221. 222. 223. 224. 225. 226. 227. 228. 229. 230. 231. 232. 233. 234. 235. 236. 237. 238. 239. 240. 241. 242. 243. 244. 245. 246. 247. 248. 249. 250. 251. 252. 253. 254. 255. 256. 257. 258. 259. 260. 261. 262. 263. 264. 265. 266. 267. 268. 269. 270. 271. 272. 273. 274. 275. 276. 277. 278. 279. 280. 281. 282. 283. 284. 285. 286. 287. 288. 289. 290. 291. 292. 293. 294. 295. 296. 297. 298. 299. 300. 301. 302. 303. 304. 305. 306. 307. 308. 309. 310. 311. 312. 313. 314. 315. 316. 317. 318. 319. 320. 321. 322. 323. 324. 325. 326. 327. 328. 329. 330. 331. 332. 333. 334. 335. 336. 337. 338. 339. 340. 341. 342. 343. 344. 345. 346. 347. 348. 349. 350. 351. 352. 353. 354. 355. 356. 357. 358. 359. 360. 361. 362. 363. 364. 365. 366. 367. 368. 369. 370. 371. 372. 373. 374. 375. 376. 377. 378. 379. 380. 381. 382. 383. 384. 385. 386. 387. 388. 389. 390. 391. 392. 393. 394. 395. 396. 397. 398. 399. 400. 401. 402. 403. 404. 405. 406. 407. 408. 409. 410. 411. 412. 413. 414. 415. 416. 417. 418. 419. 420. 421. 422. 423. 424. 425. 426. 427. 428. 429. 430. 431. 432. 433. 434. 435. 436. 437. 438. 439. 440. 441. 442. 443. 444. 445. 446. 447. 448. 449. 450. 451. 452. 453. 454. 455. 456. 457. 458. 459. 460. 461. 462. 463. 464. 465. 466. 467. 468. 469. 470. 471. 472. 473. 474. 475. 476. 477. 478. 479. 480. 481. 482. 483. 484. 485. 486. 487. 488. 489. 490. 491. 492. 493. 494. 495. 496. 497. 498. 499. 500. 501. 502. 503. 504. 505. 506. 507. 508. 509. 510. 511. 512. 513. 514. 515. 516. 517. 518. 519. 520. 521. 522. 523. 524. 525. 526. 527. 528. 529. 530. 531. 532. 533. 534. 535. 536. 537. 538. 539. 540. 541. 542. 543. 544. 545. 546. 547. 548. 549. 550. 551. 552. 553. 554. 555. 556. 557. 558. 559. 560. 561. 562. 563. 564. 565. 566. 567. 568. 569. 570. 571. 572. 573. 574. 575. 576. 577. 578. 579. 580. 581. 582. 583. 584. 585. 586. 587. 588. 589. 590. 591. 592. 593. 594. 595. 596. 597. 598. 599. 600. 601. 602. 603. 604. 605. 606. 607. 608. 609. 610. 611. 612. 613. 614. 615. 616. 617. 618. 619. 620. 621. 622. 623. 624. 625. 626. 627. 628. 629. 630. 631. 632. 633. 634. 635. 636. 637. 638. 639. 640. 641. 642. 643. 644. 645. 646. 647. 648. 649. 650. 651. 652. 653. 654. 655. 656. 657. 658. 659. 660. 661. 662. 663. 664. 665. 666. 667. 668. 669. 670. 671. 672. 673. 674. 675. 676. 677. 678. 679. 680. 681. 682. 683. 684. 685. 686. 687. 688. 689. 690. 691. 692. 693. 694. 695. 696. 697. 698. 699. 700. 701. 702. 703. 704. 705. 706. 707. 708. 709. 710. 711. 712. 713. 714. 715. 716. 717. 718. 719. 720. 721. 722. 723. 724. 725. 726. 727. 728. 729. 730. 731. 732. 733. 734. 735. 736. 737. 738. 739. 740. 741. 742. 743. 744. 745. 746. 747. 748. 749. 750. 751. 752. 753. 754. 755. 756. 757. 758. 759. 760. 761. 762. 763. 764. 765. 766. 767. 768. 769. 770. 771. 772. 773. 774. 775. 776. 777. 778. 779. 780. 781. 782. 783. 784. 785. 786. 787. 788. 789. 790. 791. 792. 793. 794. 795. 796. 797. 798. 799. 800. 801. 802. 803. 804. 805. 806. 807. 808. 809. 810. 811. 812. 813. 814. 815. 816. 817. 818. 819. 820. 821. 822. 823. 824. 825. 826. 827. 828. 829. 830. 831. 832. 833. 834. 835. 836. 837. 838. 839. 840. 841. 842. 843. 844. 845. 846. 847. 848. 849. 850. 851. 852. 853. 854. 855. 856. 857. 858. 859. 860. 861. 862. 863. 864. 865. 866. 867. 868. 869. 870. 871. 872. 873. 874. 875. 876. 877. 878. 879. 880. 881. 882. 883. 884. 885. 886. 887. 888. 889. 890. 891. 892. 893. 894. 895. 896. 897. 898. 899. 900. 901. 902. 903. 904. 905. 906. 907. 908. 909. 910. 911. 912. 913. 914. 915. 916. 917. 918. 919. 920. 921. 922. 923. 924. 925. 926. 927. 928. 929. 930. 931. 932. 933. 934. 935. 936. 937. 938. 939. 940. 941. 942. 943. 944. 945. 946. 947. 948. 949. 950. 951. 952. 953. 954. 955. 956. 957. 958. 959. 960. 961. 962. 963. 964. 965. 966. 967. 968. 969. 970. 971. 972. 973. 974. 975. 976. 977. 978. 979. 980. 981. 982. 983. 984. 985. 986. 987. 988. 989. 990. 991. 992. 993. 994. 995. 996. 997. 998. 999. 1000.

He sets His face steadfastly towards Gethsemane and Calvary—and yet we hesitate to admit to ourselves that, as this “horror of great darkness” gathered round Him and settled down upon His soul, the Son of Man’s vision of His Father’s paternal love and sovereign control of all things grew dim and that His star of hope threatened for a moment to disappear. Well, again I venture to say, we need not. Certainly those who a little later stood at the foot of His cross saw in the tragedy there being enacted a challenge to God’s paternal love, and sovereign power. For they said, fearing no contradiction: “He trusted on God, let him deliver him now, if he desireth him. For he said: I am the Son of God.” That was a challenge that only God Himself could answer, and He even only by the miracle of the resurrection and the glory of the ascension.

Indeed, it is only as we lay aside all needless fears for the dignity of our Lord’s Deity and accept the facts of the Gospel record and their natural implications without abatement, that we can hope to appreciate the wonder and the adoring reverence implicit in the words of the Evangelist when he says: “In that very hour he triumphed by the Holy Spirit, and said, I confess thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth: for thou hast hidden these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes. Even so, Father: seeing that so it was well-pleasing in thy sight.”

Further it is only as we appreciate the immeasurable strain to which our Lord found the rationality of His confidence in the power and love of His Father being subjected by the outer circumstances and inner experiences of that hour that we can really appreciate the calm majesty of the assurance with which He puts away from His own and other minds the notion of the possi-

bility of any final and real miscarriage of His mission, the possibility of any fundamental lack of accord and co-operation between His Father and Himself, saying: "All things have been delivered to me of my Father: and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him."

Finally, when we ourselves stand confronted with "the absolute and sovereign will of God," no longer merely as a perplexing theory, but now for ourselves a bitter fact of personal experience, it will be only as we grasp the solemn realities of our Lord's experiences that we can know the full preciousness and the sweet persuasiveness of the appeal: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me, and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy and my burden is light," as will be yours, if your acquiescence in "the absolute and sovereign will of God," like mine, be grounded in the assurance that God is your Father, and that He is also "Lord of heaven and earth."

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

THE EVANGELISM FOR THE TIMES

By REV. C. L. GOODELL, D.D., Executive Secretary, Commission on
Evangelism and Life Service of the Federal Council
of the Churches of Christ in America

I HEARD Ralph Waldo Emerson give his last public lecture. The subject was Eloquence. He said that one of the chief elements in eloquence was timeliness. I am sure we are all agreed that this element is always a factor, even in religion. Since so much is being said about that element in religion, it is necessary to discriminate. If "new occasions teach new duties," and make "ancient good uncouth," what if the old things which we have treasured in religion are really evanescent habits and customs which have become obsolete? Styles of manner and dress are relegated to the limbo or the attic. To what extent will this apply in matters of religion? Must the soul be as anxious to be up to the minute in its dress as is the body? Do the angels also change fashion in their robes and will the Lamb's Bride, "clad in linen pure and white which is the righteousness of saints," be also troubled lest her garments be out of style? Let us see about that.

The evangel of the Son of God has been long in the world. The good news is both old news and new news. What part of it has been outgrown, and what part is as ageless and eternal as gravitation? Because a thing is old is no reason why it should be laid aside. The sun is old, but the world is ceaselessly renewed by it, and if it has grown less in its life-giving power, we are not

sensible of it. The sea is old and the mountains, and yet they are always new.

Helen's lips are sifted dust,
 Illion is consumed with rust,
 All the galleons of Greece
 Drink the ocean's dreamless peace.

But love is always new. Time cuts no furrows in its brow, and fire and flood cannot destroy it. It is stronger than death. We are quite prepared to believe that this must also be supremely true of the love of God, and since the evangel is only the proclamation of that love, something of the evangel must remain forever unchanged.

It is an unspeakable comfort to realize that over against the religion that is only up-to-date, there is another that is dateless, like its Author, "the same yesterday, today and forever," one which had its place in the heart of God before the morning stars sang together and will be cherished there when the planets are borne out to their sepulcher along the dusty road where once blazed the milky way. The terrible things that destroy the soul have not changed, no new sin has been discovered, and, alas, no old ones have gone out of fashion. Death is the same now as when Cain looked into the face of his murdered brother. Sin is the same awful thing which broke the heart of Adam, of Edipus, and of Esau, and its shame is no other than that which Samson felt when, blind and in prison, he ground the grists of the Philistines. Are we not also comforted to sing:

O God, our help in ages past,
 Our hope for years to come,
 Our shelter from the stormy blast,
 And our eternal home.

We call Him the God of our fathers, and we love to think that He will also be the God of our children, and insist that He is also our God.

When John Robinson, before the Mayflower sailed, said that "new light would break out of the Scriptures," was he not thinking of the same old light which had been in the Scriptures from the beginning, and which lighted every man that came into the world? We may make new adaptations of steam and electricity, but with all our study we have added no new quality to either. If religion is after all a matter of style and the robe of righteousness liable any day to go out of fashion, in what shall I dress my soul? If I have to wait at the door of the professor who is most up-to-date to find what Gospel I can preach or what Gospel I can live, how sad is my estate, for alas, styles differ as much in theology as in the Bon Marché! Who can tell me what will fit me, and who is final authority on what is antiquated? May I still long for the holy comfort which has been folded down on weary hearts for long ages? May I still long to have my name written in that book whose pages turn not yellow with the passing years, the golden book wherein are written in all ages the names of those who have feared God and kept their trysts with Him?

With these thoughts in mind, let us analyze a little the question of what kind of evangelism will be really up-to-date and applicable to present day needs. That will send us back to Pentecost. That was where the church received its first preparation for a world revival which will not be ended until the last rebel breaks his sword at the feet of his Lord. Something happened then the like of which had never happened before. They were all with one accord in one place. The something which happened was born of prayer and of perfect sur-

render; that something was so mighty that it changed a poltroon and a liar and a blasphemer and made him a very lion in courage, and touched his lips with such power as to cleanse them of their falsehood and their blasphemy and make them so mighty as the vehicle of truth that thousands were turned to God by the preaching of a single sermon. Let us hope that so great a power as that, so wonderfully displayed, was not to be confined to that age, but that if the same conditions are met to-day, the same victory, the same unspeakable miracle, will take place—the false will become true, polluted lips will speak the truth, and those who took God's Name in vain will now take it to such purpose that brazen-hearted sin will flee and the stout quail before it. In some way or other we must have that old-time power. Of such a sword as that, we must say as David said concerning the sword which he had once wrested from the hand of Goliath, "There is none like it; give it to me."

We must go a step farther, and say that the purpose which is to be accomplished by the evangel is not an evanescent purpose; it lays hold of the springs of life. Jesus never made much of traditions. He scattered them as no man ever did before or since. To the cry, "It was said by men of old," He answered, "Verily, verily, *I* say unto you." He had no sympathy with ecclesiastical millinery. Religion was not a garment to be put on; it was a life to be lived. So He said, "I am come that ye might have life and that ye might have it more abundantly." It is quite evident, then, that, so far as the evangelism of the present day seems to make itself a thing not of form but of life, the methods of the Master are in no ways antiquated or outgrown. "Ye

must be born again" is a statement that fits the twentieth century as admirably as it did the first century.

Some people have been inclined to think that this command has been abrogated. They have tried the application of externals. They have treated, not the root of the disease, but its outbreking form. They have tried palliatives, not to say sedatives and bromides; but in some places, at least, in the awful arbitrament of the pragmatic test these nostrums have gone into the discard, and men are swinging back to the first century to take up once more that great eternal proclamation which the Lord of life has never abrogated. Men have come to find out that man by wisdom knows not God, but the things which have been concealed from the wise are revealed unto the simple-hearted, and that now, as of old, the truth is announced, "Except ye repent and become as little children ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of God." The old cry, the cry of Shakespeare,

Canst thou not minister to a mind diseased,
Pluck from the memory a rooted sorrow
Raze out the written troubles of the brain,
And with some sweet oblivious antidote
Cleanse the stuff'd bosom of that perilous stuff
Which weighs upon the heart?

The old answer, Shakespeare's answer, comes back from lodge and club with infinite reiteration,

Therein the patient
Must minister to himself.

But the answer of the first century was the answer of the Cross and of Him who hung upon it: "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest." "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men

unto me." And as a prophylactic against despair the church continues to sing:

There is a fountain filled with blood
 Drawn from Immanuel's veins,
 And sinners plunged beneath that flood
 Lose all their guilty stains.

Here I am quite aware there is ground for dispute. There are some who are saying, You make this a sanguinary religion. To that we plead guilty. We even make bold to say, that without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins. We affirm there is no other name given under Heaven whereby we must be saved but the Name of Jesus, whose Name was given to Him because He should be the Saviour of the world, not by His life but by His death.

There is a mistaken notion that there is a social gospel which is not at all dependent on a spiritual basis and is to take the place of the old-time evangel. Those who affirm this do not read aright the signs of the times, and are not sufficiently informed as to the arbitrament of fact. As if any social gospel would be of real use which did not have a throbbing spiritual power behind it; and, on the other hand, we must not lose sight of the fact that no life of the spirit can be long maintained that does not express itself in terms of daily life and helpfulness. We are members one of another; life takes on importance from our surroundings and responsibilities. We are sons or daughters, brothers or sisters, neighbors and friends, and every one of these relationships confers obligations, but none of these can be truly met unless the incentive is higher than a mere matter of propinquity or human relationship. We do not come to love God through love of men, but we love and serve our fellows

because we love Him who came unto the world not to be ministered unto but to minister.

There is also a mistaken notion that the climax of Jesus' teaching was the Sermon on the Mount. The world has paid its tribute to that wonderful message, though His detractors are accustomed to say that there was nothing in that message which was new. Jewish critics have said that it was in substance to be found in the Talmud and other sacred writings. Oriental critics have said that Confucius taught the same dogma. The answer to all this is that whoever may have said the same things, no one had ever lived them before Jesus came. He was the first to exemplify them in His own life. But the Golden Rule was only preliminary to something that has greater power and outreach.

Then, too, we are asked why we do not have the same physical healing as in His time. Jesus' answer is enough. He never set great store by physical healing, anyway. He used it to emphasize His wonder-working power. He told them that it was immaterial to Him in what direction that power was turned, "Whether is easier to say, Thy sins which are many are forgiven thee, or Rise up and walk?" If he had been inclined to declare His mission by His physical power, He would have made that as all inclusive as His spiritual power, but there were thousands of sick within His reach whom He did not heal. To His disciples He said, "Greater things than these shall ye do," and that promise is being fulfilled. It was blessed to heal the blind and the lame and the leper, but to open the spiritual eyes of men born blind is a greater miracle; to heal a leprous body is not half the marvel that is wrought in the cleansing of a leprous soul.

The Golden Rule would do for His inaugural, but

the message which grew with the unfolding of His life was of quite another thing in its power. It was the message of the Cross. His whole life was condensed into this great thought—He had a passion for saving the lost. He had come to bring life and immortality to light through the Gospel. His was a message of conquest over the dread thing that peoples men's lives, constantly shrieking in their ears, "Thou didst it! Thou didst it!" that terrible thing that digs graves and breaks hearts and ruins love and honor and undermines the proudest fabric which the architect called Life has ever built. With far-reaching emphasis the record declares, "When the time that he should be received up was fully come he steadfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem." The shadow of His cross lay athwart His path, and it deepened with every passing day.

Now a man is likely to weigh his words when words can be but few. It is the last time that He will speak to His friends before He goes to the garden and the flagellation and the cross. Now, if ever, He will put first things first. Because they are slow to understand and believe, much that He wanted to say to them He could not say. "Ye were not able to bear it; neither now are ye able," are His own words. Nevertheless He will tell them, in words which they will understand better as they look back upon them, the great secret of His mission. There is no attempt to rehearse the Sermon on the Mount. Listen at the door of the upper room. No one can halt at the prison door in far off Athens in an earlier age without being moved by the words of him who holds the poison cup in his hands and of whom his jailer said, "He was the gentlest and the best that ever came here." It was high discourse which the son of Sophroniscus voiced that day, but throbbing as his mes-

sage was with love and immortality, Socrates himself could not approach the surpassing love and yearning and certainty voiced by Him who was the Son of Mary and is the Son of God.

The note He raised is higher than any other that ever fell from human lips; He speaks only with certainty. He left a throne for a manger that He might fill the mansions of Heaven with citizens redeemed. The three short years of His prophetic life are condensed into this volcanic point, and His message in the upper room has done more to fill the human heart with peace and hope than all the disquisitions of all the philosophers in all the ages. He is bidding His chosen friends goodbye; here are the supreme values that time and death do not change. Why should we seek to set up lasting standards who know nothing about the eternities. The only One who knows told them and us what are the supreme values in life and to what they and we should address ourselves. Here we find what He wishes us to do. Here we find what is true enough and good enough and eternal enough to make us thrill with the call. It is the climax of all His messages to men, and we shall do well if we hush every lesser voice and listen to Him, minded to do His will.

There are some very practical things that have come to us in the aftermath of the war. They were apostles of a new set of things who said, "The old order giveth place to new;" we shall have to recast all the work of our churches. Galsworthy had said, "When the war is over mystical Christianity will be dead. It was dying before the war began. It will utterly pass away when the war is over." But the men who were looking for a corpse were disappointed. Vital religion has always had a strange capacity for coming back, and when there were

added a few hundred thousand wooden crosses in Picardy and a million widows in France and England and America, mystical Christianity received a new life, and from every martyr's grave and every hearthstone there arose a cry deeper than the heart of men had known before, "O come, let us worship and bow down: let us kneel before the Lord, our maker." They told us that when the boys came back from the trenches, we should have to change the work of our churches, and so in some places they tried to make the parish houses a combination of a doughnut kitchen and a dance hall; but if those accomplished the thing whereunto they set themselves, we have not heard of it. That was the worst year the church in America has had in a hundred years, and the recollection of it is still a nightmare to us.

No, the kind of truth the world must have to-day is felt truth, the truth of experience, the truth that has so much of life that if you cut it it would bleed. Christianity is a throbbing life. It brings news that fits the hour, for the soul is the same in all ages. Of course, we do not want stale news. We light our fires with yesterday's newspapers. We want such news as Jesus gave to the disheartened on their way to Emmaus. We want sight, for God is filling all the air with light. It is sometimes asked, What has Jesus to offer to people who observe the proprieties, pay their debts, are cultivated, and belong to good society, who do not gamble very much, nor drink very much, and are not in slavery to their passions? The answer is, "I am come that they might have *life*." In Jesus' time the Pharisees said they had it, and the Pharisees in our time repeat that affirmation, but He made short shrift of their claims when He said, "He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son hath not life."

The age is not an age of theory; it is an age that exalts practice and experience. We may not understand all mystery and all knowledge, but we must have had an experience if we are to be of service. We must have some convictions about God and duty, about sin and salvation. The world will not worship and serve a God who is simply under investigation.

Since the evangel for to-day is one of personal experience, it can only be wrought out by personal work. Men do not want to read theories. They cry, "Sayest thou this thing of thyself, or did another tell it thee?" What do you know about God? It is a time when our pastors must throttle ease in the study and go out into the streets and into the homes, with a zeal that flames on their cheeks and moistens their eyes, to solicit men to accept the salvation of Christ, without which they are undone. It is a time when laymen must cease to call religion an experience for ministers, but must go out like the laymen who laid the foundation of the church of the first century, to bring their brothers and their friends to Him who is the Light of the World. Vocational evangelists will always have their place, but they themselves understand that the ideal condition is that where each pastor, with his own officials and membership about him, undertakes to be what Jesus has called them, the light of the world and the salt of the earth.

It is time we realized that the price of winning souls is to be paid in sweat and blood and sacrifice. It is one of the sad comments on the persistency of the righteous, that in most cities it is true that no reform administration ever succeeded itself. New York can bear testimony to that. The righteous grow weary in good work, while the devil never quits his job. The forces of greed and

lust are always on the move, while the righteous are quite inclined, after some notable victory, to take a day off.

As we have said, the year 1919 was the worst year in the history of Christianity in America in the losses which the churches suffered. The great Methodist Episcopal Church, with 4,000,000 members, actually lost 69,940; the Methodist Church South lost 16,404; the Presbyterian group lost 46,459; and the Baptist group, 11,108. Perhaps humiliated by those fearful losses, they threw themselves into the contest with such devotion that the year 1920 was the greatest year in the history of the church in ingathering. The gains in the Methodist group were 237,127; the Baptist group, 129,283; in the Presbyterian group, 43,031. It is too early to give the figures for 1921, but we are fearful that they will not be as large as those of 1920. This means only that the church must never allow the fires upon her altars or within the hearts of her members to go out. They must be nourished as in the old temple at Jerusalem, and the church must clothe herself with eternal vigilance.

NEW YORK.

DISINTEGRATION OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE AND AUGUSTINE'S CITY OF GOD

By E. G. SIHLER, Ph.D., of New York University

I

THAT this double title of my last theme involves a curious interdependence of subjects is well known to all earnest and attentive students of European history. And still, on closer vision, we observe that the fundamental independence and sovereign aloofness of the spiritual commonwealth is impressively claimed, asserted, demonstrated by that mind in which the epoch of Arcadius and Honorius, of Alaric, Stilicho, and Jerome found its most varied expression and attestation, a mind, too, in which Christianity and the better culture of classic paganism were fused in a unique manner, and a mind, finally, which fairly stands alone, in that generation, in the rarest powers of deep thought no less than of keen and forceful presentation. I refer, of course, to Augustine.

And first I must beg permission of my readers to make a preliminary explanation. In Augustine's later life there came on the crisis, long maturing, in which paganism and the officially Christianized Roman Empire itself were made to suffer alike in a catastrophe, or a series of overwhelming disasters. These Gibbon (1774-1788) has related with a skill and care hitherto perhaps unexcelled, producing indeed a narrative and exposition to which the ensuing one hundred and thirty-three years

have made no noteworthy addition.¹ It is the very period in which the *Decline* is accelerating towards the *Fall*, and here indeed, in a measure, the British historian has surpassed himself.²

When Theodosius died at Milan, January 17, 395 A.D., his older son, Arcadius, then at Constantinople, was but seventeen-eighteen years old, while the younger, Honorius, was not much more than a child some ten years old. Theodosius did not really design to divide the Empire, but rather, in Diocletian's manner, to divide or apportion the task of governing the Empire. We observe that after the death of Theodosius Rome and Constantinople each furnished one of the two consuls after whom the year was named. A lad in the East, a child in the West. We must weigh this soberly. For never did the Empire more bitterly need union, a strong arm, and a sovereign mind than at that time. But when Theodosius had closed his eyes and Ambrose had pre-

¹ Unless it be Gregorovius.

² To this I here and now bear witness in a particular manner. In what way? May I venture a personal observation? Long ago and during more than four decades before the present time, I had formed the habit of avoiding as far as possible mere transcription of others' conclusions. I was never content to be a mere funnel of another man's presentation. So then, when at last I came to the generation following upon, or merging into, that of Symmachus, Ambrose, Theodosius, and Damasus, when I arrived at the era of Arcadius and Honorius, of Stilicho and Alaric, of Jerome and Augustine, I strove with great earnestness, in consummating a five years' task, not to become a mere echo of Edward Gibbon. I excerpted or abstracted, with honest care, Augustine, Orosius, Claudian the publicist and poet of Stilicho's fame (Gibbon by the bye not rarely transcribes or boldly appropriates some telling turn or touch of Claudian's, directly), the Christian poet Prudentius of Spaln (who bears witness to the remarkable tenacity, at Rome, of paganism in its last stages), Jordanes (or Jornandes), the ecclesiastic historians Sokrates and Sozomenos, and the passionately pagan Byzantine historian Zosimus. Synesios of Cyrene, in his essay on the ideal monarch (addressed to Arcadius), illumines the Gothic problem of that epoch with startling clearness.

Now then, returning from all this source work and research to Gibbon's narrative, I could not but be puzzled by the delicate nicety of his investigation of detail as well as by the fairness and felicity of many of his generalizations. At the same time, and once for all, I will set down a brief anthology of utterances, in which Gibbon's attitude towards religious matters is revealed, in his 29th and his 30th chapters: "And when

sided over the exequies, the divided throne was not only not strong, but actually and potentially weak. But my own limits prescribe a briefness inconsistent with the historical importance of the great crisis then rapidly approaching.

The Goths originally came down from Scandinavia (Scandia) to what now is southern Russia. They were drawn on by many things—a milder climate, but even more by the accumulated wealth of an older civilization, and above all by their fixed purpose to find, somewhere within or on the confines of the Roman Empire, a permanent and well chosen abode. As long as they failed to secure this they were, of necessity, migratory.

Jordanes³ tells us that they moved on before the pressure of the Mongolian Huns, who had come from Asia, and in Julian's time had reached the sea of Asow. As to these we must refer the reader to Ammian's detailed and careful description. As Julian's *quondam*

Rufinus was purified, in the holy font, from all the sins that he had hitherto committed." "The peaceful city was inflamed by the beldam Marcella and the rest of Jerome's faction." "The Pagans deplored the neglect of omens and the interruption of sacrifices; but the Christians still derived some comfort from the powerful intercession of the saints and martyrs." "Orosius [VII 37] is shocked at the impiety of the Romans, who attacked, on Easter Sunday, such pious Christians." "I wish to believe the story of St. Telemachus. Yet, no church has been dedicated, no altar has been erected to the only monk who died a martyr to the cause of humanity."

This period, then, in which everything long established seemed, by the mighty and irresistible current of events, to be swept to a final catastrophe and cataclysm, was in very truth also a test, whether the younger religion, Christianity, was or was not to perish together with paganism itself, with which it had so long contended for the mastery. It is quite impossible in these concluding studies to relate only the one without the other; quite unwise, too, to heed only the voice of the Christian leaders, then more than ever challenged to defend their own faith and hope, as in Augustine's monumental work (*De Civitate Dei*); quite impossible to follow and appreciate this without some careful narrative of secular history and what the Goths were in it, both in the *Oriens* and in the *Occidens*. Some modern manuals, like that of George Park Fisher, tell everything from the accession of Theodosius, 378 A.D., to Alaric's sack of Rome, 410 A.D., in seventeen printed lines.

³A Goth or Alan, about 551; compiled Cassiodorus, whose work is now lost.

officer puts it, they, like the Alani, were fairly grown together with their steeds.⁴ As for the Goths themselves, they had, at Adrianople, 378 A.D., delivered a staggering blow against the Eastern part of the Empire, and this very disaster had brought the foremost military expert of the Western Empire, Theodosius, into imperial responsibility. In the desperate struggle with the usurper Eugenius (394 A.D.), the Emperor just named had employed a Gothic corps as "Allies," or *Foederati*, not mercenaries, let alone subjects. The Gothic chieftains, or dukes, Gainas and Alaric, were important sub-commanders in the critical two-day battle of the Frigidus River (Wippach), at the foot of the Julian Alps. The real schemer, or Warwick, behind the wretched usurper Eugenius had been a German, the Frank, Arbogast. Even then the Empire had been sustained in great part by German semi-barbarians, who had no interest whatever in its integrity or preservation.

After the death of Theodosius, Stilicho, a man of Vandal stock, tested above all his contemporaries in Italy by the largest tasks of war and peace, husband of the late Emperor's niece Serena, politically, culturally, ecclesiastically at least, a Roman, had been appointed guide and guardian of the young boy Honorius, in whose dull or feeble *ingenium* there does not seem to have been the slightest endowment for assuming the imperial purple. The genius of no minister or strategist could have made amends for, or balanced the debility of such heirs.⁵ For Arcadius, at Constantinople, was even more a weak and utterly pampered lad, surrounded as he was and

⁴ Ammian, 31, 2, 20: *Iuventus vero equitandi usu a prima pueritia coalescens*. Perhaps we should read, <equis> *equitandi usu coalescens*. Ammian is thinking of the centaurs of Greek mythology.

⁵ *Coeperuntque eius filii utramque rempublicam luxuriose viventes adnihilare* (Jordanes, *Getica*, 146).

exploited by a camarilla of eunuchs and other vicious favorites. His chief adviser, and the virtual regent on the Bosphorus, was the minister Rufinus. We may call both him and Stilicho vicars of the Empire. Zosimus⁶ says that Arcadius and Honorius were merely *nominal* rulers; that the two prime ministers gained enormous wealth from those men of the day whose riches were notorious—that verdicts and decrees even were sold for money.⁷ The youthful “emperors” merely signed what the regents presented to them to sign. They could, at that time, hardly do more than that. However, it is clear to us, that while military capacity was in every way the most crying need of the times, in this sphere Stilicho at Milan was incomparably superior to Rufinus on the Bosphorus. The former had been left by Theodosius as *magister utriusque militiae*, or supreme head of the army.

In the earlier part of this year, 395, Alaric the Goth marched towards Constantinople from Moesia, obviously to extort tribute or some large territorial grant; besides, the annual payments to the Goths had been withheld. Alaric advanced as far as the outskirts of the Eastern capital. Perhaps Rufinus bought him off. Alaric with his Goths now traversed Macedon and entered Thessaly. Here Stilicho with a Roman army confronted him, near Larissa. Most of Stilicho's troops were those which, having served against the usurper Eugenius, were now being conducted back to the Bosphorus. Now the Goths under Alaric in Thessaly were in an impregnable position; their camp was fortified by their customary bul-

⁶ V, 1. Zosimus was a *comes* at Constantinople, and an official of the imperial treasury there. He seems to have written between 450–500 A.D. Cf. L. Mendelsohn, *Rheinisches Museum*, vol. 42, p. 525 *sqq.*

⁷ Of course, if we trust Stilicho's herald of fame, Claudian, such abuses were confined to the practice of Rufinus at Constantinople. The article *Rufinus* in Suidas seems largely to have been derived from Zosimus.

wark⁸ of carts, with pasture space within, all surrounded by a double foss; the draught-oxen had been slaughtered. The pass of Thermopylae was evacuated⁹ to leave to the Goths a free passage towards the south. And the pocket of the Peloponnesian peninsula too might eventually prove a trap¹⁰ for the Teutonic invaders.

As for Stilicho, we must not forget, that the contingents which he had been conducting east, with Constantinople their ultimate goal, were the least efficient legions (according to Zosimus) in all the army but recently commanded by Theodosius. Rufinus earnestly desired that his mighty rival of Rome and Milan should not appear before the gates of Constantinople. North Greece had been cruelly ravaged by Alaric (according to Zosimus); the men put to the sword, women and children driven off herdwise, with all the wealth then seized. And still the Goths were, in a fashion, Christians, Arian Christians. Were they really Christianized? Before Stilicho could undertake a regular campaign against Alaric in Thessaly he received peremptory orders from the Eastern capital, to withdraw from the Eastern Empire and dismiss to Constantinople the contingents owing allegiance to Arcadius. Meanwhile, too, the Huns had broken through on the Caspian, had passed through Armenia into Syria, and after vainly besieging Antioch, had entered Asia Minor.

Nothing now hindered Alaric from invading classic Greece. The reader of these studies will not forget that "Hellas" still was the symbol and surname of classic paganism, and that the earnest pagans, by preference,

⁸ Claudian, V, 126.

⁹ Zosimus (V, 5) says, by order of Rufinus—and Zosimus makes Rufinus responsible for all the disasters that followed from these beginnings.

¹⁰ Von Wietersheim, *Geschichte der Voelkerwanderung*, 1864, vol. 4, p. 186.

simply called themselves "Greeks" (Hellenes), and that the illustrious seats of Hellenism were now exposed to a despoiling and destructive invasion, against which the glorious memories of Marathon, Salamis, and Plataea furnished no bulwark. For one decade the Empire had had a respite from storms coming from beyond the frontiers, but Theodosius was no more and the prestige of his name was rapidly and everywhere vanishing. In Constantinople the wretched prime minister Rufinus had been done to death before the town by infuriated soldiery returning from the West; the eunuch Eutropius, scheming to be his successor, had cleverly arranged a marriage for the lad Arcadius; the young lady who so promptly captivated his fancy was Eudoxia; bearing indeed this pure Greek name she was nevertheless the daughter of a Frank, Bauto, who, born on the east bank of the Rhine, had assisted Theodosius against the Goths and even held the consulate on January 1, 385 A.D., when Augustine delivered his eulogy before him, rendering thanks for his appointment, at Milan.

Alaric now traversed Boeotia, neglecting the towns there, for he was hastening towards the venerable metropolis of "Hellenism," Athens herself. The Old Believers there, later on, recited and passed on as a legend, the story, that Athena Promachos, protectress of her own tutelary city, in her panoply, such as one could see in her cult-figures, had warned off the Goth, that the Achilles of the Iliad in supernatural apparition, had associated himself with her in that defense,¹¹ and that this induced Alaric to deal more gently with Athens than he would otherwise have done. Clearly there still abounded in the classic town those Athenians who even

¹¹ Ein von den Heiden erfundenes Tendenz-maerchen (Otto Seeck, *Alaricus*, Wissowa, col. 1287).

then clung to the ancient gods not any less than to the ancient culture, men who at Athens held the same ground which at Rome had been held by Praetextatus, by Symmachus, Flavianus, and the others periodically gathered in the conventicles idealized by Macrobius.

Claudian, a contemporary of Alaric, says that Attic matrons were carried off as captives of war.¹² Now if Alaric did not spare these, he certainly did not spare their treasures; it is quite likely that he did spare the architecture of the Acropolis, the Erechtheum, the Parthenon, but exceedingly unlikely that he spared the sacred treasures there accumulated for more than eight centuries. Megara was taken without any struggle. Then Alaric entered the Peloponnesus, nowhere meeting any serious resistance. Did Gerontius weakly or treacherously abandon the Isthmus? The fortifications there had furnished to the places within the famous peninsula their security, or at least their sense of security.¹³ There was no further defense, Zosimus says. At once Corinth was taken (without capitulation), as well as the minor towns. The smoke of the conflagration of the famous Isthmian emporium soon rolled out on the Aegean Sea and the Gulf of Corinth.¹⁴ It is true, Corinth had lost much of its commercial eminence to Alexandria and Rhodes, but still she had been the capital of the Roman province of Achaia.¹⁵ One marvels that not even the towering Acro-corinth had been made into an impregnable fortress. If the great sanctuary of Poseidon had

¹² Claudian, II, 191: *Nec fera Cecropiae traxissent vincula matres.*

¹³ Zosimus, V, 6.

¹⁴ *Non mare fumasset geminum flagrante Corinθο* (Claudian, II, 190).

¹⁵ In the time of Augustus and Tiberius the entire circumference of the walls had been not less than 85 stadia, some ten miles of our measurement (Strabo, p. 379, Kramer). From the level of the city to the top of Acro-corinth the distance by the winding ascent was 30 stadia, or more than three miles. In the latter Empire the defenses of Corinth probably had fallen into decay.

still contained the works of art and other treasures described by Pausanias¹⁶ in the era of the Antonines—some of gold, some of ivory, as Castor and Pollux, the guiding stars of seafaring men—then these certainly were not spared by Alaric, who associated no idea whatever of sacrilege with the spoliation of pagan temples. Soon venerable Argos (favorite abode of Hera) shared the fate of her northern neighbor, and Sparta, once fortified by her stout manhood alone, was now helpless.

As Alaric and his men had to live off the country directly, the entire peninsula almost must have been utterly stripped of whatever supplies of grain she was wont to sustain herself by. Zosimus thinks the officials of the Eastern Empire must have been traitors—a vain imputation; traditions and idealizations cannot protect decaying and decadent communities in such a crisis. Did Olympia share the general fate? Few spots in all the Hellenic world were so rich in treasure and monuments, few so hallowed by the veneration or affection of the ages and the nations, few indeed could have furnished as many attractions to Alaric and his despoiling Goths. We have a contemporary utterance written by Jerome in his monastery of Bethlehem, probably in this very year 396, in which the sadness of the times is most eloquently reflected:¹⁷

“It is now twenty years or more, since, in all that territory which lies between Constantinople and the Julian Alps, daily has Roman blood been shed. The Goths, Sarmatians, Quadians, Alans, Huns, Vandals, and Marcomanni are laying waste, overrunning, pillaging, Scythia, Thrace, Macedon, Dardania, Dacia (modern Rumania), Thessaly, Greece, Epirus, Dalmatia,

¹⁶ II, 1, 7.

¹⁷ Jerome, *Epistolae*, 60, § 16 (*ad Heliodorum*).

and all the provinces of Pannonia (Hungary). How many matrons, how many nuns, how many persons of gentle blood and of aristocratic lineage have been the sport of these monsters! Bishops have been made prisoners, presbyters put to the sword * * *. Churches have been destroyed, horses stalled at the altars of Christ, bones of martyrs dug out. * * * The Roman world is tottering to its fall, and still our proud neck will not bend. What spirit now do you think have the people of Athens, of Corinth, of Sparta, of Arcadia, of all Greece, over which the barbarians hold sway?"

We note particularly this last statement. But even while the fiery ascetic of Bethlehem was writing help was coming from the West. Stilicho having secured or settled the Rhine frontier through treaties, sailed into the Corinthian gulf with a Roman army, marched into Arcadia, and succeeded in blockading the invaders at Pholoë near the sources of the Alpheios.¹⁸ Disease and famine carried off many of the invaders. The public opinion of that day asked why Stilicho did not utterly annihilate the remainder. What was left of southern Greece could breathe more freely.¹⁹ Somehow Alaric did escape with his remnant and, crossing the Corinthian gulf, ravaged Epirus. But those in power at Constantinople bade Stilicho depart from Greece. In the end he arranged that Alaric became governor or viceroy of Illyricum with an annual allowance differing little from tribute.

The fact seems to be that neither Italy nor the provinces had any longer the vigor or fitness of military

¹⁸ Claudian, VIII, 460 *sqq.*

¹⁹ *Excutiat cineres Ephyre [Corinth], Spartanus et Arcas Tutior exsanguis pedibus proculcet acervos Fessaque pensatis respiret Graecia poenis* (Claudian, VIII, 471, *sqq.*). Zosimus (V, 7) bitterly charges Stilicho with being smitten by women, etc., etc.

efficiency; drained and burdened by an exhausting system of century-old and ever increasing taxation, the subjects in the provinces could neither protect themselves nor had they any strong motive for saving Rome or the beaurocrats imposed upon them by the Roman system. Now Stilicho was more familiar with all these things than any one or all of the older Roman aristocracy who lived in a nebula of grand memories and long-inherited pretensions. Constantinople was even worse off than Milan or Rome, for Arcadius had no Stilicho for guide or counselor.

Now there is preserved for us a political essay by Synesius of Cyrene, written and addressed to Arcadius himself at Constantinople at this very time, 397,²⁰ the very year when the harrowing devastation of classic Greece must have been uppermost in all minds. This political paper of the waning century and waning Roman Empire abounds with curious lights and suggestions for the student of that period, an epoch when Stilicho (vicegerent of the West and the only prop remaining for sustaining, amid incessant anxieties, the old order) had been declared a public enemy by the feeble youth Arcadius. Of course this foolish act was entirely due to his chief advisers, among whom the eunuch Eutropius was the most powerful. Synesius deals with the ideal ruler, but not quite abstractly; the essay indeed often touches very plainly actual conditions, permitting a close vision of many problems of the day.

Synesius was to deliver a golden wreath to Arcadius

²⁰ Cf. the admirable monograph on Synesius, by T. R. Halcomb, of Lincoln College, Oxford, in Smith and Wace, vol. IV, 1887, pp. 756-780. The favorite world of the Cyrenian scholar, then about thirty-two-thirty-three years old, was that of Homer and Hesiod, Herodotus and Plato. Among his ideals of administrative efficiency are Cyrus, Pericles, Agesilaus, Iphicrates, Epaminondas.

and incidentally to petition for a reduction of Cyrene's taxation. Theodosius, he urged, had gained the purple through military efficiency, while to the present ruler the throne had come without toil or achievement. Both imperial youths were inexperienced, whereas the times were stern. The mere multitude of the sheep did not automatically produce excellence in the shepherd, who must not fatten himself on his flock. The Emperor should personally and directly be known to his troops, not merely through images and portraits. It was evil that the eunuchs kept Arcadius from the public gaze, like a divine being not seeing or hearing what was wholesome for him to see and hear, given over to the grosser pleasures of life,²¹ "a mere jelly-fish, not a human being."²² Synesius sharply rebukes the luxury of Arcadius' dress, like that of a veritable peacock; the times indeed demanded Spartan simplicity.

The whole Roman Empire was like a body full of ailments. Non-Romans, alas, constituted the strength of imperial defense while Romans were excused from service—alas, the military service was in the hands of Goths! There was need of conscription of Romans. Our own people, said he, are unwarlike, fond of theaters, mere drones. Those worthy to be called men *are no Romans*. It is these who gain the victories for the Empire. The men of arms will rule. But yesterday these Goths wore their rude sheepskins; today they assume the senatorial toga and share in the deliberations of government. It is a disgrace. Again, look at the households of Constantinople; they swarm with the same blond and longhaired barbarians. Of course, they can-

²¹ Synesius, *De Regno*, 15: Μόνας ἡδόμενους τὰς τοῦ σώματος ἡδονάς, καὶ τούτων γὰρ τὰς ὑλικωτάτας. See also the citation from Chrysostom in Gibbon, ch. 32.

²² A Platonic remembrance. We marvel at the boldness of the phrase.

not be faithful and loyal, because they hope to rule their present masters some day. He seems to allude to Stilicho in bitter innuendo, but he refrains from naming him. Whether high or low, these barbarians have an ethnic consciousness which knits them closely together. Check the evil now, before it becomes invincible. The Goths behaved meekly to Theodosius after he defeated them, but he took the grave step of making them "allies" of Rome. Arcadius should now adopt a vigorous policy of preparation and preparedness. As for the soldiery in garrisons, they must be watch-dogs, not wolves among the flock. The grinding imports of imperial taxation must be reduced or more fairly adjusted; for governors you should choose not the richest men (as now), but the best ones.²³

As for imperial decrees concerning religion at this time, they were equally severe against heretics and against Old Believers at the older capital; though we may well doubt as to any serious execution there, though now there is a state church and a hierarchy rigidly attentive to all the possibilities of increasing their power in a palpable manner. The Jews enjoyed complete religious freedom.²⁴

Meanwhile the cleft between Rome (Milan) and Constantinople was widening. Gildo, governor of the province of Africa, rose in rebellion against the government of Honorius or Stilicho. His plan was, to attach the province, one of the granaries more than ever essential to Rome, to the Eastern Empire. Besides, the grain fleets of Alexandria²⁵ now regularly were sent to

²³ Synesius, *op. cit.*, 21, 25, 28.

²⁴ For data and texts, see Clinton, *Fasti Romani*, sub anno 396.

²⁵ Cum subiit par Roma [the city of Constantinople] mihi divisaque sumpsit aequales aurora togas, Aegyptia rura in parteum cessere novam. Spes unica nobis restabat Libye (Claudian, XV, 61 *sqq.*).

Constantinople. On the Tiber, for a while, the famine was severe. Gildo, by controlling the grain of "Africa" (the province) had accumulated great wealth. But Stilicho arranged to bring grain from Gaul, and in the spring of 398 Gildo, deserted by his own troops, was captured and executed.²⁶

In 399, the wretched prime minister of Arcadius, the eunuch Eutropius, fell into disgrace and found refuge in a Christian church of the capital, while crouching under an altar and listening to a discourse of the bishop, John Chrysostom. The new dangers threatening Arcadius from the treacherous Goth Gainas and the latter's end, I have no space here to relate.

As for Rome, we observe that Stilicho had once more endowed the Senate with some share of counsel and interest in the current business of government.²⁷ The interval of peace was but brief. Apart from the maintenance of the Rhine frontier, from the task of defending Britain against Picts and Scots, and against Anglo-Saxon fleets, the vicegerent of the West was compelled (in 401 or 402) to defend Italy herself against Alaric. It was the first time Germans had invaded Italy since the Cimbri had come down by the Brenner, some 500 years before. Alaric, after taking many cities, advanced on Milan, where was the court of Honorius, then a youth of nineteen. Stilicho hastened up with his recent levies and raised the siege. Alaric had used the resources of Illyricum entrusted to him to prepare this very invasion. He then marched westward into Piedmont, where he could cross the Po more easily and then march on Rome itself, a city infinitely richer than Athens or Corinth—Rome, despoiler and exploiter of the Medi-

²⁶ O. Seeck, in Wissowa; *s.v.* *Gildo*.

²⁷ Claudian, XXI, 328.

terranean world for many centuries. That capital was in an anxious state. On Easter Sunday, April 6, 402 (Seeck), near Pollentia (some thirty miles south south-west of Turin) a battle was fought which had important results. The Tiber indeed was there defended; the Goths (who were Arians) did not, it seems, expect any clash of arms on that great anniversary of the Christian religion.²⁸ The forces of Stilicho were largely non-Italian, non-Roman. Night put an end to the struggle, but Alaric lost his camp with all his loot²⁹ of recent years. Still he was even yet a great menace, and Stilicho preferred to make a military treaty with him, for the Goths had taken a strong position in the Apennines. Alaric, however, did not keep his engagements, but attempted to take Verone on his way home by a sudden stroke. In this he failed and after fearful hardships escaped once more across the Julian Alps into his own Illyricum.

This was the zenith of Stilicho's fortunes. Rome abandoned herself to unbounded rejoicings and felicitations the echoes of which still resound from Claudian's hexameters no less than in the verse of Prudentius, the fervid Christian poet, who had come from Spain to Rome in this sunset period of Roman glory. Even now, after Pollentia, the bitter spirit of the Old Believers at Rome was still rife; Symmachus and his friends and kindred were not backward in charging upon the Christian religion the evils of the times.

"There are those," wrote Prudentius,³⁰ then at Rome, "who do not hesitate to taunt us with the unfortunate

²⁸ On the entire campaign, *cf.* Claudian, XXVI, *De Bello Pollentino*, v. 571. Romanum reparate decus molemque labantis Imperii fulcite umeris.

²⁹ So Claudian claimed.

³⁰ *Contra Symmachum*, II, 683 *sqq.*

wars, after we had despised the altars of the temples, and they say that Afric Hannibal was driven back from the hinges of the Colline Gate [211 B.C.] through the orders of Jove and Mars—they say that the victorious Senones were routed [389 B.C.] from the Capitoline citadel since the divine powers above were battling from the lofty rock. * * * The Gothic usurper recently [in the Pollentia campaign] tried to destroy Italy, coming from his ancestral Danube, sworn to level these towering structures, to dissolve with fire the gold-plated roofs,⁸¹ and now, forging ahead, he had laid waste the fields of the Veneti with his squadrons, had pillaged the wealth of the Ligurians and the charming farmsteads of the deep Po, and he was threatening Tuscan soil, having passed the stream [the Po]. Those clouds of horsemen were driven back not by the watchful goose [of the Capitol] that told of the hidden danger in the darkness of night, but the blunt force of men and the breasts of men broken in the shock and the spirit not dreading to die for the country and to seek fair fame through wounds. Really did that day [of Pollentia] too, under Jove's guidance, confer so great a reward of valor? [Follows some courtier phrase.] No, the leader of that band and chief command was a youth [Honorius] powerful through Christ [Christipotens] and his companion and father was Stilicho; they both had one and the same God, Christ. Having worshiped at His altars and having inscribed the cross on their foreheads; ahead of the serpents hastened the spear which raises the diadem of Christ more upward. There [at Pollentia] the tribe of Pannonia [the Goths], so deadly for thrice ten years, at last was destroyed [sic] and paid the penalty. The bodies once enriched by notorious looting, now lie,

⁸¹ Especially of Jupiter Capitolinus.

gathered into heaps; thou, Posterity, wilt marvel in late ages at the bodies [skeletons] far and wide, which covered the fields of Pollentia."

Clearly this poem or paean was composed when the news from Pollentia was fresh and the old Mistress of the World was once more preparing for something like a triumph: *Vicimus: exultare licet*.

As for the Old Believers, the Spanish Christian employs against them substantially the arguments used by Ambrose against Symmachus³² some eighteen years before.

There are gladiators still in Rome; the mysteries of Mithras are still celebrated; only a few years later a barbarian far more ruthless than Alaric invaded Italy from the North. His name was Radagais. Fearful as this new danger was, the tradition of those years is fragmentary and obscure. He commanded³³ at least some 200,000 fighting men. Perhaps he had been with Alaric, and perhaps he was an Ostrogoth. Augustine³⁴ simply calls him "King of the Goths." Having taken several cities, he divided his huge host into several armies, under separate chieftains. Stilicho (relying largely on Hun mercenaries) gathered some thirty legions near Ticinum (Pavia), entered Tuscany, crossed the Arno, and inflicted a crushing defeat on Radagais near Fiesole, close by Florence. Or was it enclosure and starvation which caused the destruction of Radagais' corps? That leader surrendered and was executed. The survivors of his host were sold into slavery, and so vast was their

³² As Seeck computes, Symmachus had been sent to Milan, on the part of the Senate, evidently before Pollentia, to entreat protection for Rome. Cf. Symmachus, *Epistolæ*, ed. Seeck, VIII, 2, 13; IV, 9; V, 95. It was still winter when he went and when he returned to Rome (V, 96).

³³ Orosius, VII, 37. Zosimus is so vague that he confounds Danube with Arno.

³⁴ *De Civitate Dei*, V, 23.

number that they brought but one gold piece a head. Most of them were so emaciated that they soon died, and their burial cost more than the purchase price had been. Even then, the pagans in Italy had insisted that only the gods of Rome could save her,⁸⁵ powers which the Christian church called *daemones*. Never did the star of Stilicho shine more brightly; a triumphal arch⁸⁶ was erected "by the Senate and People of Rome." On it was chiseled the official but somewhat fanciful manifesto, "that the race of the Goths was extinguished for all time." As a matter of fact, Alaric had been steadily repairing the severe losses of Pollentia, and was biding his time.

December 31, 406 A.D., is one of the great dates of universal history. On that day huge masses of Vandals, Alani, and Suevi crossed the Rhine and entered Gaul, then the richest domain of the Roman Empire, having defeated the Franks. After pillaging far and wide, they finally reached the Pyrenees. Jerome, at Bethlehem, a few years later wrote thus: "Whatever land is between Alps and Pyrenees, between ocean and Rhine, Quadi, Vandals, Sarmatians, Alani, Gepids, Herulians, Saxons, Burgundians, Alemanni * * * have laid waste."⁸⁷ At the same time a subject of Rome, Constantinus, with Britain for his base, crossed into Gaul, much of which he held for a time, and even parts of Spain. His son Constans had been summoned from a monastery. And now even the loyal "Honorians" in Spain⁸⁸ ultimately

⁸⁵ *Op. cit.*, V, 23

⁸⁶ In Dessau's collection, I, 798, Berlin, 1892: *Imppp. clementissimis toto orbe victoribus ddd. nnn. [dominis nostris] Arcadio Honorio Theodosio Auggg. [ustis: the prince last named being the infant son of Arcadius and Eudoxia] ad perenne indicium triumphorum, quod Getarum nationem in omne aevum docuere extingui [sic], arcum cum simulacris eorum tropaeisque decoratum S. p. q. R. totius operis splendore.*

⁸⁷ Orosius, VII, 40.

⁸⁸ So Zosimus, V, 27, holds.

permitted the German barbarians to enter Spain, the very time when the Spanish Presbyter Orosius was concluding his apologetic history of Rome. Amid all these overwhelming disasters the shadow-ruler Honorius, about twenty-four years old, felt himself safe neither at Milan nor Rome, but chose Ravenna for his residence, rendered impregnable from land attack by a system of sea fosses surrounding her fortifications. He was now married to Thermantia, second daughter of Stilicho and Serena, whose older daughter Maria, his first wife—child wife—had died.

On May 1, 408, the wretched Arcadius passed away at Constantinople, some thirty-one years old. Was Alaric in Illyricum a mere *locum tenens* to hold it for ultimate annexation to the Western Empire?³⁹ Did the death of Arcadius stir Alaric? He now established his general camp at Emona (Laybach) whence he marched into Noricum (lower Austria). Thence came his envoys to Ravenna, demanding funds to reimburse him for his long delay in Epirus and the costs of his present operations. It was an urgent matter, and Stilicho in person appealed to the Roman Senate to vote for an appropriation; rejection would mean war. The majority of the Senate proudly protested, feeding their souls on the past; never should Rome purchase peace! In the end Stilicho prevailed; 4000 pounds of gold were voted. One senator, Lampridius, indeed shouted: "That is no peace, but a settlement of slavery!" But he promptly fled for asylum into a Christian church close at hand. Stilicho had opposed the choice of Ravenna for imperial residence, and earnestly also opposed the project of Honorius to go to Constantinople to settle

³⁹ Zosimus, V, 29, actually cites the Latin original: Non est ista pax, sed pactio servitutis—perhaps it became a winged word.

the affairs of the deceased Arcadius; of course Honorius was utterly incompetent for such a task. He suggested also sending Alaric against the usurper Constantinus, who then had established his government at Arelate (Arles).

As Honorius now journeyed from Bologna to Pavia, a cunning courtier, the Greek upstart Olympius, poisoned the feeble sovereign's mind, whispering into his ear that Stilicho wished, after reaching Constantinople, to place his own son Eucherius on the Eastern throne. The new favorite at Pavia, Olympius, set in motion a soldier's mutiny; German sub-commanders were suddenly cut down, among them the commander of the household troops; whoever held high post or emolument through Stilicho, perished; it was a vendetta of Romans against Teutons, an outbreak of a fury essentially racial. Stilicho's Hun body guards were massacred at night. Stilicho, hastening to Ravenna, fled into a Christian church out of which he was lured by lies and slain by imperial orders, August 23, 408. His young son Eucherius soon shared his fate.⁴⁰ While the last bulwark of Rome was gone, the new prime minister, Olympius, assumed the rule of Defender of the Faith against a threatened restoration of paganism. Many of Stilicho's appointees were tortured to furnish some material to charge his memory with treason. Honorius divorced Stilicho's daughter Thermantia. Huge confiscations followed.

⁴⁰ Orosius, writing very soon after these events, utters the current propaganda in which all Christian ecclesiastics seem to have agreed: *Occisus est Stilicho, qui, ut unum puerum purpura indueret, totius generis humani sanguinem deditit. Occisus est et Eucherius, qui ad sibi consiliandum favorem paganorum, restitutione templorum et eversione ecclesiarum imbuturum se regni primordia minabatur* (Orosius, VII, 38)—an absolute falsehood. Jerome at Bethlehem, *Epistolae*, 123, 17, calls Stilicho *semibarbarus proditor*. Zosimus (V, 34) extols the integrity of Stilicho as tested by a public career of some twenty-three years.

All survivors from the vendetta of Olympius sought shelter in the camp of Alaric. Racial feeling or fellow feeling of those who suffer particularly in times of persecution, is ever a mighty force in the souls and lives of men. The Goth now again demanded funds, with exchange of hostages and withdrawal to Danube country. Honorius, directed by his adviser, rejected all this and also appointed incompetent men to the higher military commands. Alaric now summoned his wife's brother, Ataulph, to join him soon. He himself passed by Aquileia and crossed the Po at Cremona; then, ignoring Ravenna, he appeared before Rome in the later autumn. Then the rabid Senate decreed execution for Stilicho's widow Serena.⁴¹ Alaric completely inhibited all provisioning of Rome. At once the city was rationed, with steadily shrinking allotments; on famine followed the sequence of a plague, nor could the dead be buried outside of the city, which thus become a ghastly tomb of her own dwellers, poisoning the breath of the survivors. Now only did the Romans realize that Alaric himself was there. The foolish threats of the envoys he treated with scorn. "The denser the hay," he said, "the easier the mowing!" It was Alaric indeed.

There were Old Believers who proposed that the Senate now resort to ritual atonements as prescribed by the Pontifical Books then (still extant). That the bishop Innocentius actually consented to such a course is more than we can believe; in fact we should reject it because Zosimus writes it. All, however, shrank from sharing in the essential publicity of the proposed rites. The

⁴¹Zosimus (V, 38), the consistent Old Believer, herein discovers a retributive act of the gods, for Serena had appropriated for her own use a necklace which had adorned the cult-figure of the Magna Mater. An old Vestal, Zosimus adds, had at that time uttered imprecations to Serena's face. Stilicho was charged with having removed the gold plates from the doors of Jupiter Capitolinus.

final terms of capitulation were as follows: 5,000 pounds of gold, 30,000 of silver, 4,000 tunics of silk, 3,000 fleeces dyed in purple, 3,000 pounds of pepper. It was necessary then even to melt up some of the ornaments of ancient cult-figures, such as *Virtus*. Honorius, personally safe at Ravenna, was impotent to inhibit these enactments of the Roman senators. The capital was once more provisioned and Alaric retired to Tuscany, joined by some 40,000 slaves.⁴² The Senate sent envoys to Ravenna, requesting that a durable peace be concluded, but Olympius blocked everything, being chiefly occupied still with branding the memory of his eminent predecessor. Honorius despatched a body of troops to strengthen the feeble garrison of Rome; Alaric destroyed them.

Ataulph now arrived with the Gothic reinforcements from the Danube country. Then at last Honorius, urged by the eunuchs, deposed Olympius who fled to Dalmatia. The garrison at Ravenna became mutinous; their incompetent commanders were exiled, but those who conducted them away, slew them, by secret orders of Jovius, on whom the wretched Emperor now leaned. This newest adviser had a conference with Alaric at Ariminum, but Honorius refused to accept one of the chief demands of the Goth, viz., that Alaric be made chief commander of the forces of the Empire. When this refusal came by letter from Ravenna,⁴³ Alaric became angry, but first warned the Romans by using as his mouthpieces the Christian bishops of North Italy. He now demanded Noricum (lower Austria) entire, a moderate annual tribute of money and of grain. Zosimus⁴⁴ calls these demands fair. Jovius counseled

⁴² Zosimus, V, 41, 42.

⁴³ Zosimus, V, 49.

⁴⁴ V, 51: Ταῦτα ἐπιεικῶς καὶ σωφρόνως Ἀλαρίχου προτεινομένου.

non-acceptance. Once more Alaric appeared before Rome. The Senate chose Attalus, then city prefect, emperor, a pompous and vain character. He "appointed" Alaric chief commander of the forces, and sipped the sweets of his sudden elevation by vainglorious proclamations, the ancient aristocratic house of the Anicii alone holding aloof from the general joy. We must, however, be brief. Alaric was soon disgusted with his imperial puppet, who marched on Ravenna with dire threats against trembling Honorius. Alaric cast Attalus over and marched on Rome for the third time. It was now in the summer of 410—August 24. Stilicho's stipulations with the Goth had never been carried out. The bishop Innocentius was safely away.

It seems hard to believe, with Gregorovius,⁴⁵ that the former capital of the Mediterranean world should have shrunk from the one and one-half millions of Trajan's time (say 110 A.D.) to a mere 300,000, in three hundred years' time. To Orosius in Spain, Christian presbyter as he was and with close personal relations to Augustine and to Jerome, the Rome of 410 appeared a place of iniquity.⁴⁶ It was believed at the time that Alaric entered Rome through some treasonable understanding. The tradition is fragmentary but harmonious in this one point: While the great town was plundered to the very bones and the barbarians indulged every passion of a maddened soldiery together with the intoxicating sense of irresponsible and wanton power to do or dare anything whatsoever to wealth and possession,

⁴⁵ *Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter*, 4th ed., 1886, I, p. 144. The enormous difficulty of attending efficiently to the grain supply of Rome, as it comes to our notice again and again in the letters of Symmachus and elsewhere, would seem to imply a larger population than 300,000.

⁴⁶ Orosius, VII, 39, *Superba lascivia, et blasphema civitas*. Orosius does not seem ever to have visited Rome directly. Cf. VII, 39 *ut ferunt*.

to age or sex, still Alaric ordered that immunity should be observed for all persons and ecclesiastic objects within the basilicas of Peter and Paul and some other consecrated abodes of martyrs' memorials (Orosius, VII, 39). Many pagans joined these processions which, amid the chanting of hymns, sought such asylum. On the third day the Goths withdrew, convinced no doubt that they had gained what they sought.

Thus, too, Gregorovius reminds the reader of the fulfilment of that sad vision which entered the noble soul of the younger Scipio in the year 146, as he was gazing on the extinction of Carthage, so long the rival of Rome's ambition, and the commercial mistress of the seas. The Scipio felt that in some unknown future day Rome, too, would pass, and to his lips, somewhat instinctively, came the lines of the Iliad:

The day will be when sacred Troy will cease to be
And Priam too and people of Priam [once] good with ashen
spear.⁴⁷

⁴⁷ So recorded by Polybius, 39, 6, an eye and ear witness of the memorable scene. Iliad, VI, 448-449.

Ἐσσεται ἡμαρ, ὅτ' ἂν ποτ' ὀλώλῃ Ἴλιος ἱρή,
Καὶ Πρίαμος καὶ λαὸς ἐυμμελής Πριάμοιο.

THE WRITTEN WORD

By JAMES H. SNOWDEN, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Systematic Theology
in the Western Theological Seminary, and Editor of
The Presbyterian Magazine, New York

(A paper read before the Presbyterian World Alliance, at Pittsburgh)

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF WORDS

A WORD is a wonderful thing. Though it is the very oldest human invention, and one that has lost its wonder through having become so familiar and apparently simple and commonplace, yet a word is still the most marvelous of all human achievements, and is incomparably the most powerful instrument of our life.

A word is a sound or a printed sign; this is its outer form or shell; but its inner meaning goes deep as the human soul and is as mysterious as life itself. A word is a symbol of a thought. It is a bridge that connects one mind with another. It is the telegraphic or telephonic conductor that discharges the contents of one mind into another. It leaps from the lip to the ear, or from the printed page to the eye, and closes the circuit so that thought flashes from mind to mind. A thought is crystallized into a word in one mind, and the crystal is transported, it may be, across continents or centuries, and dropped into another mind, and then dissolves back into its original idea, so that the two minds are saturated with the same thought, or they think as one. Words are a universal sea of life rolling around us and sending their waves up on the shore line of each individual mind.

And thus words are the means of all human intelligence, communication, action, progress, and power. We

cannot think, except in the most rudimentary degree, without words. "To think," says Max Müller, "is to speak low, and to speak is to think aloud." The most enormous chasm between the savage and the civilized man is measured by the three or four hundred words of the Patagonian compared with the three or four thousand words of the Englishman.

Words transact all the business of life for us. They furnish the journalist with his record for the history of a day, the lawyer with his brief and argument, the physician with his prescription, the minister with his sermon, the scientist with the instrument for his investigations, the metaphysician with the terms for his subtle distinctions, the statesman with his laws and constitutions, the orator with the music and majesty of his eloquence, the novelist with the colors for his pictures of life, and the poet with the airy drapery for his dreams. They carry on our conversations and weave the whole web of our social life.

Printed words embalm all the centuries and transmit to us the thoughts and deeds of the innumerable dead and resurrect all the pageantry of the past. Words are fossilized history and life. Libraries are the fossilized brains of thinkers that are gone. The poetic thoughts that soared in Shakespeare's imagination spread their wings in our minds, and the ideas that glowed in Plato's intellect burn again in our brains, as the light of suns that shone millions of years ago is relit in our fires and electric lights. The pomp of Assyria is lying latent in our words, and all "the glory that was Greece and the grandeur that was Rome."

Words reflect all the hues of our many-colored spirit world. They are transparent with clear thought, or misty and muddy with obscurity. They are clean-cut,

like sharply-minted coins, with precision and decision, or muffled with vagueness and uncertainty. They gleam and sparkle with humor and wit, or are heavy and dull with stupidity. They are icy cold with haughtiness, or warm with sympathy. They are pliant and plastic, many-tinted and iridescent, to express all the various shapes and delicate shades of thought and feeling.

Words have in them the potency of all life. They are big with the issues of time and eternity. They have kindled wars and slain empires, and they have been the white-winged messengers of peace. A single word has saved a soul, or broken a heart.

When God communicated with the world of His lost children He sent the glorious Living Word, splendid with the radiance of His infinite and eternal purity and beauty, in whom we see the express image of His Person and the brightness of His glory, and through whom He most fully reveals Himself to us and we hold fellowship with Him.

Words, however, notwithstanding their immense utility and power and all their beauty and glory, like all things human have their limitations and defects. Their most serious limitation is this: A word is never a sign of a single, certain, definite, and fixed content which always and everywhere means just the same to all minds, but it may have any number of meanings from two or three to forty or fifty; and each of these significations is a varying and more or less different meaning to different minds. This difficulty is rooted in both the mind that gives forth the word as the expression of its idea and the mind that receives it. The speaker or writer uttering the word puts into it its content of meaning, and this is shaped and colored by his own stock of knowledge or apperception, and the hearer or reader

receiving the word, in turn interprets its meaning according to his knowledge or apperception. And thus the same word means something different, and it may be widely or even contradictorily different, to these two minds.

All the knowledge and error and understanding and misunderstanding and divergent motives and intentions and conflicting interests and heated passions of these two minds necessarily enter into the forming and uttering of the word in the one, and into the receiving and interpreting of it in the other. Words thus have overtones. As the same note of music issuing from different instruments is deeply and richly colored in quality by the peculiar overtones of each instrument, so the same word as used by different minds is greatly modified in meaning by the special apperception of each mind. It is, therefore, quite impossible that any two minds should attach exactly the same meaning to any word; and this difficulty is greatly multiplied and complicated when words are combined into sentences and extended speech.

Because words are not fixed, but variable signs, plastic and iridescent, carrying different connotations and implications, surrounded with different fringes and atmospheres of subtle associations and suggestions, it follows that in the very nature of human thought and speech such a thing as a perfectly infallible and inerrant communication of ideas is psychologically impossible. The simplest sentence conveys different meanings to different minds, and as many different meanings as there are minds hearing it. This difficulty is doubled or trebled when ideas are translated from one language into another, as the words of one language never have their exact counterparts with identical meanings in another. It is this diversity and ever-varying meaning

of words that is the root of much if not most of the misunderstanding and confusion and strife that attend the use of language; and it gave birth to Talleyrand's saying that language is a device to conceal thought.

This element of error in language can in a degree be guarded against by the careful use and close definition of words, but it cannot be wholly avoided, for it is inherent in the nature of human speech and will ever infect it. Nevertheless, it does not destroy or even seriously impair the practical use of language. In spite of these difficulties and dangers we do get along with our speech, and could not get along without it. All human tools are imperfect, and yet they do our work immeasurably better than it could be done with no tools at all. Notwithstanding its limitations and defects language remains incomparably the most useful invention of man, and is the chief expression of his power and glory.

APPLICATION OF THE PSYCHOLOGY OF WORDS TO SCRIPTURE

This psychology of words has been drawn out, perhaps to undue length, in order that it may now be applied to the Word as it is written in Holy Scripture. In communicating the revelation of His wisdom and will to man, God had to condescend to man's level and adopt man's speech and accommodate Himself to human capacity and means. Hence God spoke and wrote through holy men as they were moved by His Holy Spirit, using their human speech and the speech of their own language and day. This speech was necessarily shaped out of and colored with all the knowledge and experience of these men, involving their ideas of science and philosophy, ethics and religion, their social customs and

political forms of government, and their personal and racial experience. And this process of communication was subject to the necessary limitations of language which have just been noted.

It is true, however, that the Spirit of God breathed into these human words higher spiritual ideas and life, and thus transformed and transfigured them with divine meaning and power. A great thinker or poet can thus in some degree elevate and transform language with his genius, as Shakespeare takes our commonest words and gives them wings of imagination, or makes them throb with new power and glory. So, in a higher degree, the Holy Spirit surcharged these poor human words, in which the soul of man had for ages endeavored so imperfectly, and often so pathetically, to express his religious needs and yearnings, with divine life that has exalted them and made them the most illuminating and quickening words in the things of the spirit the world has ever heard.

We are here treading on the borders of inspiration, a subject too profound and complex and subtle to be treated, even in the most summary fashion, within a few paragraphs of this paper. It is significant that no definition of inspiration has been attempted in any of the Reformed symbols; and yet the fact itself is firmly imbedded in our historic faith. We agree on the doctrine as long as we do not endeavor to define it. The fact is accepted without dispute, but questions of the methods and degrees of the fact give rise to many theories.

It may be said in a word, that the Bible is a book that God made for us men and our salvation, and that it is sufficient for this end; but this fact, which lies on the surface as well as in the deeps of Holy Scripture and is

the saving essence of the Book, still leaves open for investigation the human processes through which the Holy Spirit worked. The simple broad fact is that the Bible is both human and divine; the form is human, but the substance is divine; the vessel is earthen, but the spiritual content is Heavenly. To draw a line of demarcation between these two elements involves us in difficulties and disagreements. We meet with a similar problem in the union of the body and the soul in the personality of man, and in the still deeper mystery of the union of the human and the divine in the Person of Christ.

Draw if thou canst the mystic line,
Severing rightly His from thine,
Which is human, which divine.

Yet, as neither of these problems of unity in diversity involves us in practical difficulties, and life and grace go on without waiting on our solution of them, so in the case of the Bible its unsolved problems in connection with its inspiration do not hinder us from feeding upon it as the bread of life, and little children can find in it the sincere milk of the Word.

The difficulty, however, as to the limitations of human language still holds as to the written Word of God, with the added and accumulated defects due to its translation into other tongues and its transmission through the centuries.

This fact has been and is prolific in consequences. It furnishes the necessity for and the basis of the Biblical sciences, such as introduction, criticism, hermeneutics, exegesis, theology, and, largely, of preaching itself. It has given birth to the whole business of writing commentaries that have overlaid Scripture with vast libraries, some of these commentaries illuminating Holy

Writ and others of them darkening its council with their own words. It has produced the myriad divergent interpretations of Scripture, the same verse or word being made to yield inconsistent or contradictory meanings. It has permitted the process of extracting from the Scriptures every wild and fantastic vagary, for there is no absurdity or imbecility so impossible or unthinkable that it cannot be found in and drawn out of the Bible when the subjective conceit or obsession of the interpreter has first put it in. It has enabled the advocates of every heresy and false doctrine and gross immorality to claim the support of the Scriptures for their errors and their wickedness. The Pharisees had carried this cunning art to perfection even in their day.

These different meanings of Scripture are the root of our denominational divisions. It was a single letter of a single Greek word, and that the smallest letter in the Greek alphabet, that split widely asunder early Christendom into the Eastern Orthodox and the Western Roman Catholic churches, and different interpretations of the same Scriptures have kept on dividing churches down to this day.

And so the written Word, because it is written, and because it is written with words, must be interpreted, and out of this necessary process arises this "dust of systems and of creeds."

This difficulty of the interpretation of the written Word has its disadvantages, but it also has its great compensations. It forces us to prolonged and ever fresh investigation and study and meditation and prayer in our use of Scripture, and what an education and blessing has this been to the church and the world. It has made the Bible a mine, ever yielding richer treasures of truth and grace, turned it into a constellation that is ever

blazing out in new stars. Treasures that are too easy and cheap are little valued. Some precious things are precious chiefly because they are hard to get. If we could pick up gold on the street it would have no value, and if everybody could have diamonds nobody would want them. A Bible easy to understand would not challenge us, and might have little interest and worth for us. It would be a poor and pitiful book on any subject that we could see through at the first glance. We appreciate the Bible the more because it taxes our brains, arouses our utmost powers, and we have to work our way by patient processes and through years of toil closer to the mind of the Spirit and extract from it, as wheat from stony soil and water from rock, the very bread and water of life.

It is true that the Bible is plain and easy enough for children and all simple folk, containing for them "the sincere milk of the Word," but it is also hard enough for scholars and contains meat for men. In this respect it is quite analogous to nature, which is a world in which the most untutored people and little children can practically live and find bread satisfying and the sunlight sweet, untroubled with questions of chemistry and solar physics, but which also bristles with difficulties for the scientist and has depths which the profoundest philosopher cannot fathom.

It is by these studies that we are ever finding new and wondrous things in the written Word, that our eyes are being opened and we are ever coming upon surprises and unexpected sources and riches of wealth; that we are ever made to lie down in green pastures and are led beside still waters; that we find that the written Word is more to be desired than gold, yea, than much fine gold, and that it is sweeter than honey and the honey-

comb. It is by this searching that more and more we discover that the written Word testifies of Christ and is spirit and life.

These difficulties, therefore, do not excuse us from, and should not discourage us in, the use of the written Word, but should only urge us to a more faithful and thorough study of it, that we may ever approximate more closely to its true meaning. Such study has been going on through all these Christian centuries, and it is a simple, self-evident fact that it is getting somewhere in an ever truer and better understanding of the Bible. Christ Himself is ever fulfilling His promise, that the Comforter would take of these things and show them unto us, and His still greater promise that He has yet many things to say unto us, but we cannot bear them now; yet we can bear them and shall surely have them shown unto us as we continue in the study of and obedience to the written Word.

And so these limitations of human words as applied to the written Word of the Bible lose their terror. As they do not practically prevent or seriously interfere with the communication of human ideas in business, society, government, science, literature, and art, and do keep this whole human world going, so they do not greatly hinder the passage of the essential ideas of God and the mind of the Spirit into the human soul. The written Word is abundantly sufficient for our salvation, and in this sense it is "the only infallible rule of faith and practice." The written Word is still the Word of God.

We are now prepared to understand more definitely how the written words of Scripture "are spirit and are life." These words, spoken or written by prophets and apostles and by Jesus Himself, bring to us their very

thoughts and recreate them in our minds so as to beget in us the same spiritual ideas and states and experiences they had. The laws of Moses are thus still ruling the world; the Psalms of David, his penitence and tears, aspirations and attainments, and all his immortal lyrics, the splendid visions of Isaiah and the Lamentations of Jeremiah, the proverbial wisdom of Solomon and the sublime poetry of Job, are dropped as crystals into our minds and hearts and melt back into substantially the same states in us, and thus we are not only caught by their precepts, but are also in a degree filled with their life.

The whole Old Testament is thus dissolved in us and absorbed into our spiritual blood, and the New Testament passes through the same process. The life of Jesus is lived over again for us from His birth through all its scenes and sayings to its glorious end. Again we hear the angels sing and go with the shepherds to Bethlehem, and again we walk the highways and byways of Palestine as they were pressed by His blessed feet and witness His mighty works and hear His very words. We are present in the inner circle of the disciples or in the larger audience down on the plain as the Sermon on the Mount falls from His lips; we see Him steeped in splendor as He is transfigured on the mountain top; we stand before the cross and witness its sublime tragedy; and we see the empty tomb and experience all the excitement and wonder of the resurrection morning, and stand gazing into Heaven at His ascension.

We are present at Pentecost and on Mars' Hill, and we hear Peter and Paul preach with their mighty logic and eloquence. We are spectators of a momentous conflict and epochal victory as Christianity struggles free from the swaddling bands of Judaism and steps out into

the Gentile world, lands on the shore of Europe, and starts forth on its worldwide march. We go with Paul to Corinth and Rome, and we look over his shoulder and read his letters as he writes profound theological Epistles or soars into a prose-poem or drops a brief note to a friend. Paul's very thoughts are recreated in our minds, and our hearts are rekindled and glow with his emotions. John infuses his mystic Gospel into our spirits and unrolls his grand apocalyptic pictures in the gallery of our imagination.

Words thus carry us back into the scenes and sayings of the Bible and reproduce it all in our minds, dissolve it in our souls. It makes us live over again the lives and experiences of the prophets and apostles, and fashions us into their likeness. We weep with their tears, rejoice with their joys, are tried with their temptations, and win victories by their strength. The Bible pours their blood into our veins. It crowds our consciousness back into their consciousness, even into the human consciousness of Christ, and thus we live, and yet not we, but Christ liveth in us.

The Bible is full of this psychology of its working, for it is a masterpiece of this science at every point and is incomparably the greatest book of religious psychology in the world. Listen to a few familiar sentences:

"Thy word have I hid in my heart" (Psa. 119:11).

"The entrance of thy words giveth light" (Psa. 119:130).

"The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life" (John 6:63).

"Thou hast the words of eternal life" (John 6:68).

"Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth" (John 17:17).

"For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and

sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart" (Heb. 4:12).

And thus by absorbing and assimilating the written Word it becomes transformed in us into the living Word, as bread becomes our blood and the bloom of the scarlet peach becomes the blush of the rosy cheek.

This is how the truth contained in the written Word feeds us and causes us to grow in the Christian life. This is the reason such constant and strenuous emphasis is put on the Bible by the church, and by the Bible itself. This is why we should ever read, mark, and meditate upon it, and thus dissolve it in our spiritual blood that it may reappear in the strength and fruitfulness, the beauty and blessedness of our Christian life.

One final question: Could Christianity have been propagated without the written Word? Is the Bible a necessity? Let it be admitted that the Gospel could have been transmitted through the ages in some measure without any written Word. The church on the day of Pentecost had no leaf or line of the New Testament, but had only the verbally transmitted knowledge of the life and work of Christ. Tradition could have kept this stream flowing, though with inevitable decreasing purity and power and increasing incertitude and corruption in its course through the years and centuries. There are religions that long survive without any book.

Christianity, however, is emphatically a book religion. "It is written" is a main charter and channel of its life, and is its safeguard. This fact, that is sometimes thrown at it as a criticism and offense, is one source of its strength and glory. The Bible is not the Saviour of the world, and is not to be worshiped as such,

but is a vital artery that keeps us in living relations with the Saviour and transmits His life in a fuller and purer tide to the world. If the Written Word were blotted out of existence, the Living Word would be deprived of its clearest and fullest voice and be greatly shorn of its power.

Then let us make the largest use of the Written Word, that we may grow in this life and spread it through the world. To this end let scholarship study the Bible with the freest hand and the most searching methods, and forbid it not and fear it not. Any cry raised against such honest and fearless study is a cowardly and false cry, false to the teaching and spirit of Him who is the Truth. They do the Bible an ill service and show weak faith and faint courage who join in this cry. The Book itself bids us search the Scriptures, and is fearless of any consequences. It has withstood the acid test and flames of the critical laboratory, and after a century of the keenest investigation it stands like a rock in a stormy sea. Still hold true the words that fell so calmly and so majestically from the lips of the Son of God: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."

JUDAS, THE MINISTER WHO BETRAYED HIS LORD

By PROFESSOR A. T. ROBERTSON, Litt.D., Southern Baptist Theological
Seminary

THE case of Judas is the saddest of all those who came in contact with Jesus during His earthly ministry. Others sinned grievously, but Judas sinned against more light than they all. Simon Peter denied his Lord under sudden impulse when caught in the toils of circumstance, but Judas sinned with deliberate and calculated treachery. Pilate sinned against Roman law, according to his own confession, but he palliated his conscience like some other politicians by laying the blame upon the Sanhedrin. The sin of Caiaphas was greater than that of Pilate, as Jesus said (John 18:11). The Sanhedrin gleefully accepted their share of the guilt for the death of Jesus (John 19:7), while the populace enthusiastically exclaimed: "His blood be on us and our children" (Matt. 27:25). There was guilt enough for all. Sadducees, Pharisees, and Herodians buried the hatchet against each other for the moment in order to vent their spleen against Jesus, the common object of their hatred.

But Judas stands out above all the rest as the supreme example of treachery for all time. His very name, though one of the commonest and most honorable in ancient Jewish history (merely the Greek form of Judah) became the synonym for all that is base and mean. Benedict Arnold can only be called a second Judas. "The enormity of the sin of Judas consisted in

its being against all bonds of discipleship and friendship; against light, against mercies, affection, trust, warnings; against his own promises and preaching" (Plummer in Hastings Dictionary of the Bible). Keim argues that it is impossible to think that the treason of Judas would have been invented if he had not been guilty. With all the minute research into the details of the life of Jesus in the Gospels, no serious effort has been made to show that Judas did not betray his Lord. And Judas does not stand alone in the history of Christianity, though he does head the list of traitors. A few men who once preached the glory of Jesus have lived to curse His Name to the end.

There have been those who sought to relieve Judas of real blame for his conduct by various specious arguments. The commonest plea is that he was the chosen vessel to betray Jesus so that He could die for sinners, that it was God's plan that Christ should die on the cross, and that this could only happen by betrayal to the Sanhedrin, because of Christ's power with the people. But this explanation handles in too light and easy a manner the whole problem of the origin of evil and of human responsibility. There is no real ground for saying that Judas was put among the Twelve Apostles in order that he might betray Jesus. Certainly Jesus did not say that He selected Judas because He knew that he would betray Him. It is not clear from John 6:64 that Jesus meant to say that He knew from the beginning of His own ministry who would betray Him. He may mean only that in the early stages of the work of Judas He saw signs that Judas was given over to the work of the devil and would betray Him. That was clear to Jesus, one year before the end (John 6:70), though the exposure seems not to have shocked the Twelve at that

time. Already the heart of Judas was with those who walked no more with Jesus (John 6:66).

Some would even make Judas a sort of hero, in that he tried out of excess of patriotism and loyalty to force the hand of Jesus and compel Him to be king in open rebellion to Caesar. The idea is, that Judas disliked the refusal of Jesus to respond to the popular clamor in Galilee a year before His death (John 6:15). The triumphant entry gave Jesus a great following, but even so, He showed no purpose to follow it up in a political way. If Jesus were in the hands of the Sanhedrin, the people would rally to His standard and throw off the Roman yoke. So the argument runs; but it is very feeble and inconclusive and overlooks too many items that demand explanation, especially the fact that Jesus calls Judas a devil (John 6:70).

Others argue that Judas was wholly evil, without any element of good, that he even sought out a place among the Twelve in order that he might have an opportunity to betray Jesus. Beyond doubt Judas early fell into the power of the devil. Both Luke (22:3) and John (13:27) say that Satan entered into Judas just before the betrayal, and, as we have seen, Jesus called Judas a devil a year before that. Evidently, therefore, the connection of Judas with the devil was no new and sudden thing. In fact, John (13:2) observes that Satan had "already" put the notion of betrayal into his heart. It is clear, therefore, that Judas had for some time brooded over his dark project in secret communing with the devil. Probably at first the suggestion was more or less unconscious, but finally he was fully aware of his own purpose and welcomed the periodic visits and impulses of Satan in his heart. Undoubtedly Judas played with temptation until finally he became the tool

of the devil, who wrought his own will through him. But, in the last analysis, that is the story of many a sordid life. The worst "dope fiend" became a degenerate by degrees. There was a time when resistance was possible.

Judas had elements of good in him that appealed to Jesus. "Ye did not choose me, but I chose you and appointed you that ye should go and bear fruit, and that your fruit should abide" (John 15:16). And Jesus thanked the Father for giving Him these twelve men (John 17:6): "And I guarded them and not one of them perished, but the son of perdition" (John 17:12). But "the son of perdition" brought that fate upon himself, Jesus clearly means. The Master early perceived the elements of peril in Judas, and began to warn him in subtle ways and then more openly. But these warnings against hypocrisy probably at first passed by undiscerned. When they became more personal, they were probably bitterly resented as "flings" and proof of Christ's dislike for Judas. It is hardly likely that Judas would take to himself the general denunciation of covetousness and hypocrisy or even the implication that the light in any of them might be darkness (Luke 11:35). When Jesus spoke of one of them being a devil (John 7:70), Judas may have passed the epithet on to others, as people will do with hits in sermons. And when at the end the language of Jesus was unmistakable, Judas was simply confirmed in his purpose to go on with his hellish bargain. "Ye are clean, but not all" (John 12:10). "He that eateth my bread lifted up his heel against me" (John 13:18).

When Jesus pointedly said at the last supper: "One of you shall betray me, *even* he that eateth with me" (Mark 14:18), the other disciples were sorrowful

and amazed and looked on one another to see if they could see signs of such treachery (John 13:22). When each asked, "Is it I?" Judas did the same thing brazenly (Matt. 26:25). He would "bluff it out" as long as he could, though he now knew that Jesus understood him thoroughly. The disciples actually questioned one another on the subject (Luke 22:23), but failed to grasp the significance of the sign when Jesus gave the sop to Judas as He indicated in response to John's question to Jesus at the suggestion of Peter (John 13:23-26). It is even possible that Judas got the post of honor at this last feast, a circumstance that would blacken his character still more. But Judas understood perfectly the language of Jesus: "What thou doest, do quickly." He was now wholly in the grasp of the devil, and the warnings of Jesus apparently only exasperated him to go on to the end.

It is not possible to explain the career of Judas by one motive. It is not possible to explain the conduct of any ordinary man in that way. Jesus was in complete fellowship with the Father. He was both God and man, but the Father's will ruled His life. Of no one else can that be said in that sense. Mixed motives control most men and women in what they do. That was certainly true of Judas. We may put it down as certain that he did not consciously set out to be a traitor. He was undoubtedly drawn to Jesus at first by the charm of His words and by the nobility of His character. Like the other apostles he brought the Pharisaic conception of a political Messiah with him, and he held on to that in spite of the teaching of Jesus to the contrary. It was not till the great Pentecost that the rest saw the truth about that fundamental point. Judas was dead by that

time. It is possible to trace some of the motives that led Judas astray.

Ambition was undoubtedly one of them. It is quite likely that he thought of himself as the leader of the Twelve. In Mark 14:10 the best manuscripts call Judas "the one of the twelve." We know that they had several disputes on that very point as to which was first. Simon Peter felt himself the natural leader of the group because of his ready speech and impulsive character. At Pentecost, after the Ascension of Jesus, he did take the lead. Jesus was the real leader while on earth. James and John openly demanded the two best places for themselves, a selfish request that stirred the indignation of the rest. During the last year of His ministry Jesus took pains to explain to the disciples the spiritual nature of His Kingdom and by degrees the fact of His death in Jerusalem. Peter openly rebuked Jesus for speaking in such a despondent way of His death and brought upon himself the epithet "Satan." All this slowly sank into the heart of Judas and disappointed ambition rankled in his breast. He grasped firmly the conviction that he cared far more for a certain place in a new political revolution than for shadowy hopes about a spiritual and Heavenly Kingdom. After the glory of the triumphal entry on Sunday morning, it must not be overlooked that on Tuesday morning in the temple Jesus made open breach with the Sanhedrin and made it impossible for the religious leaders to accept Him as Messiah. On the Mount of Olives Jesus had delivered an extended discourse full of woe and disaster for the city and the world. Pessimism evidently gripped Judas powerfully at the turn of events. He may have decided to save what he could out of the wreck.

Jealousy also played its part beyond a doubt. Judas

was the only apostle from Judea. The rest were from Galilee. This fact would tend to make him suspicious about little things. At the Last Supper there was an unseemly scramble for the place of honor next to Jesus. It is not certain who got it, whether Judas, Peter or John. But we do know that the wrangling continued during the feast, after all had reclined, to such extent that Jesus arose and took a basin of water and a towel and began to wash the disciples' feet to give them an object lesson in humility. Wounded pride heals slowly. Judas may have felt that Jesus suspected him and would honor the others, men of inferior powers, in preference to himself. Thus he would come to justify himself in his own feelings toward Jesus.

Undoubtedly Judas felt resentment at the public rebuke given him by Jesus at the feast at the house of Simon the leper. Judas made the protest against the apparent waste of money by Mary for the ointment (John 12:5). To be sure, his mention of the poor was a flimsy pretext, but all the other disciples instantly joined in and supported Judas in his criticism of Mary (Mark 14:4; Matt. 26:8). The rebuke of Jesus was direct, and manifestly cut Judas to the quick. The breach between Judas and Jesus was now wide open. Jesus appreciated sentiment and love and even spoke of His death in this connection (John 12:7). Judas was practical and selfish and thought chiefly of what he could get out of his allegiance to Christ. He had followed Christ in the ups and downs of His ministry. He had seen Him the hero of all Galilee and had done his share to arouse Galilee when the Twelve toured the land by twos. He had preached Christ's Gospel of the Kingdom and had cast out demons. He had gone with Jesus when a practical

refugee from Galilee and had seen the gathering storm in Jerusalem. He had done his part to turn Jesus away from the folly of a complete breach with the Jewish leaders in Jerusalem. This public rebuke before all the Twelve and the other guests he considered an unforgivable insult. It was the last straw on the camel's back. He left the feast at Bethany in disgust, and went straight to the Sanhedrin and offered to betray Jesus to them (Mark 14:10). He acted as if in hot resentment, but it was not a new thought. Satan entered into him afresh at this juncture (Luke 22:3), but he was now ripe for the devil's hand.

Covetousness played its part also in the ruin of the soul of Judas. John notes that Judas was a thief and had been in the habit of pilfering from the company bag that he carried for all (John 12:6). But John's comment is made in the light of the after development. At this stage no one of them suspected him of financial crookedness. He was the treasurer of the company, and had won this place of responsible leadership because of business ability and a practical turn for affairs. He no doubt felt that, as treasurer of the group, he had a right to file a protest against the reckless and foolish extravagance of Mary in the waste of so much money on mere sentiment. They had not had too much money and often were in want, with nowhere to lay their heads. But for the handful of women who ministered to them of their substance (Luke 8:1-3) their condition would have been much worse. The covetousness of Judas appeared to him as economy and good business sense. Many another has excused his own stinginess with polite terms of like nature. The love of money cheapens a man's whole nature and does much to destroy the finer qualities.

At any rate Judas seems blunt and brutal as a spy before the Sanhedrin: "What are ye willing to give me, and I will deliver him unto you?" (Matt. 26:15). It is hard to believe that even a miser would have come over to the enemy for so small a price as thirty pieces of silver which the chief priests weighed out unto him in advance (Matt. 26:15). It was the price of a slave (Exodus 21:32), and that fact would give added pleasure to Judas in his mood of angry resentment and disappointed ambition. He acted probably on impulse in going all of a sudden to the Sanhedrin to make the proposal to show them how to seize Jesus during the feast, in spite of the multitude of adherents that he had (Luke 22:6). But he stuck to his nefarious bargain with deliberation and pertinacity. He had plenty of opportunity to change his mind and to return the money. On the other hand, "he sought opportunity" to deliver Jesus to the Sanhedrin.

So the shameful compact was carried through to the letter. Judas came back and took his accustomed place with the eleven who suspected nothing to the end. They even misunderstood Christ's last word to Judas, before he left on his awful mission, as a message about his duties as treasurer (John 13:29), even after Jesus had exposed the betrayer to them all. They did not have eyes to see such treachery. Judas was a coward, like most criminals. He knew the real power of Jesus, and came to the Garden of Gethsemane, Christ's favorite place of prayer, and took advantage of his knowledge of Christ's habits of piety (John 18:2). But even so, he came with a band of soldiers and with lanterns and torches and weapons (John 18:3). Judas felt the power of Jesus in the bold challenge and the manifestation of the supernatural power (John 18:4-9). But there was

no turning back now. Judas had crossed the Rubicon. There was no need for him to go on with his sign to the soldiers to identify Jesus. He was already marked out by his own conduct. But Judas kissed Jesus excessively (Mark 14:45), adding insult to injury. The last word of Jesus to Judas made it plain that he was understood (Matt. 26:50).

The remorse of Judas was in keeping with all the rest. It was not real repentance, but only sorrow at the outcome. After the actual condemnation of Jesus Judas began to see himself in his true light. The blur of anger and resentment subsided enough for him to see his own portrait. That has often happened with a murderer or a rapist after the deed is done. Gloating satisfaction gives place to a reviving conscience that whips like a scorpion sting. So in a frenzy he rushed to the chief priests and confessed his crime: "I have sinned in that I have betrayed innocent blood" (Matt. 27:4). But they were not interested in that phase of the subject: "What is that to us? See thou to it" (Matt. 27:5). He flung the pieces of money into the sanctuary, where he was not himself allowed to go, and departed.

There are two accounts of the death of Judas, that in Matthew 27:4-10 and that in Acts 1:18-19. They differ in several details and are probably independent accounts. It is possible to harmonize them if one wishes to do so. He may have hanged himself and have fallen down, the rope breaking, and burst asunder. The field could have been called the field of blood because his own blood was shed on it, or because the Sanhedrin bought it with blood money, the price of the death of Jesus, and so have used it as a potter's field for burying strang-

ers. At any rate the chief priests apparently took the money that they had spurned, but used it for this special purpose. There are legends about his death that may be passed by.

The greatest Tragedy of the Ages carried with it the treachery of Judas and the faltering of Simon Peter, two of the leading apostles. In fact, they all deserted for a time and fled like sheep without a shepherd, as Jesus had said they would. But Peter sincerely repented and came back and made good. But Judas went over the cliff. He went down with the Niagara flood. Peter says that "he went to his own place" (Acts 1:25). He went to the doom that he had earned for himself. We are all caught in the web of circumstance, and at times we seem the victims of destiny that we cannot control. But our spiritual destiny we make for ourselves. Terrible as was the fate of Judas, one must conclude that he had in him the making of a great preacher of Christ's Gospel. Jesus saw the good that was possible in Judas, as He did in Simon. But Simon, in spite of his ups and downs, became at last a rock, while Judas became a devil. Both were under the tutelage of Jesus. Both had the same privileges. Both were men of weakness and frailty. One fought the devil after momentary defeat. The other courted the devil and listened to his blandishments.

Judas carries a perpetual warning to every preacher of Christ. Paul saw the peril clearly: "I therefore so run as not uncertainly, I so fight as not beating the air, but I beat my body and keep it in subjection, lest, after having preached to others, I myself should become rejected" (1 Cor. 9:26-27). Paul warned us not to give place to the devil (Eph. 4:27). Others can tread under

foot the Son of God (Heb. 10:29) and crucify Him afresh and put Him to an open shame (Heb. 6:6). It is a high and holy privilege to be allowed to come into the inner circle of Christ's followers. It is a dread catastrophe to see such a one sink back into the pit from which he was digged. It were indeed good for that man if he had not been born (Matt. 26:24).

LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY.

SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE

By ROBERT P. WILDER, General Secretary of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions

THE first thing that struck me on the occasion of my recent visit to Southeastern Europe was the political and industrial unrest. Just before my visit to Belgrade, the Parliament in Jugoslavia had voted more money for military purposes than the entire sum allocated to roads, education, and churches. The reason given was that Jugoslavia lies between Hungary and Bulgaria. In Bulgaria I found great activity to build up what was lost during the war, because Bulgaria stands between Jugoslavia, Greece, and Rumania. In Bucharest I noted soldiers and officers very much in evidence and was told that the cause for this was that fifty thousand Bolsheviks were massed on the frontier and if they attacked the Rumanians in front, probably the Bulgarians and Magyars would fall upon the rear. In Hungary I found great dissatisfaction with the terms of the Peace Conference treaty and a longing to recover as soon as possible the territory which had belonged to Hungary before the war. In many of the small shops one constantly saw post-cards representing Hungary divided into four parts and bearing the words: "No, no, never!" In one of the leading squares of Budapest I discovered four statues representing *Hungaria Irredenta*. These keep constantly open the wound of what is regarded as a gross international injustice. At a meeting of fifteen hundred students in Budapest the chairman of the committee of welcome, who was a

Roman Catholic representing twenty student societies, said to us from the platform:

"Perhaps you may carry with you the message of Hungary's students to the West, which has passed judgment on us in such superficial carelessness and in such utmost ignorance of the facts; to the West which has torn our beautiful country to pieces, has rendered so many of the best of our people beggars, and has delivered up more than three and a half millions of our Hungarian brethren to the caprice and brutal force of enemies, condemning our highly developed civilization to drop to the level of the Balkans. * * * We do not address any requests to you. What we do ask for is just your hands of friendship and your sympathizing hearts, and also that you would carry with you this our message to students of happier lands. * * * We can never for a moment forget the tragedy of our country. * * * We have a Hungarian faith, a Hungarian aim, a great Hungarian tragedy, and a great Hungarian program. And to these, in the very interest of our common progress, we can and shall never become untrue."

On reaching Bratislava, called Pozsony before the war, I saw two marine officers passing on the street. Asking who they were, the reply signified that they belonged to the new Czechoslovak navy.

"But why do you want a navy? Your country is far from the sea." To this came the reply:

"The Paris Peace Conference permits us to send our ships down the Elbe River through Germany to Hamburg and to the North Sea. We can also sail down the Danube to the Black Sea. Hence we must have a navy to protect our shipping."

Those nations which have won territory are banding

together to retain it, hence the *Petite Entente* of Yugoslavia Czechoslovakia, and Rumania; those nations which have lost territory are restive, bitter, angry, and despairing. Before the war the Austro-Hungarian Empire had a population of forty-five millions; now Austria has only six millions. Students of that country told me that they had no future, economically or nationally. Without union with Germany they believe that economic ruin will overtake them, while union with Germany would prevent separate national existence.

Within each nation there is also political unrest and dissatisfaction. A royal ruler in one of the Balkan states said to me: "Politicians are our great difficulty. They are the least patriotic. Why is it that people can unite in time of war but not in time of peace?" Before the war, Serbia had a population of only four millions; now in Yugoslavia, in which Serbia is the leading partner, the population is over thirteen millions, but this population is not as homogeneous as formerly. While the members of the Orthodox Church number seven millions, of the Roman Catholic five millions, there are in all over one million Mohammedans and a couple of hundred thousand Protestants. For centuries the Orthodox Church has been the state church in Serbia. Croatia has been since the eighth century Roman Catholic in the main. Ninety out of the four hundred deputies in the *Skupshchina* (Parliament) in Belgrade come from Croatia. No wonder the sparks are inclined to fly when they gather together. The members of all religions in Yugoslavia are free before the law and are helped by the state in proportion to their membership, yet there are many friction points between the Roman Catholic, Orthodox, and Mohammedan deputies.

The population of Rumania before the war was only

eight millions. It is now over eighteen millions, twelve and one-half belonging to the Orthodox Church. One and one-half million are members of the United Church (*Uniats*), one million are Roman Catholics, two million are Protestants, and one and one-quarter million are Jews, and there are in addition one hundred and fifty thousand Mohammedans in the Dobrudja, which was formerly under Bulgaria. Before the law there is religious freedom for all sects, but internal friction is pronounced, especially among the Hungarians and Rumanians in Transylvania. In the latter country it was necessary for me to have separate meetings for Hungarian and Rumanian students, because they will not assemble together.

In Czechoslovakia also I found it essential to have separate gatherings of Czech and German students. In this land for many years a bitter struggle has raged between Czech and German cultures. The Czechs and Slovaks are Slavs numbering ten and one-half millions, but the Germans and Magyars together constitute a powerful minority of nearly three millions. In addition, throughout Southeastern Europe the Jews seem to be nearly universally disliked and feared. In Czechoslovakia a question was put by a German student:

"Is it true that Jesus was of Aryan and not Jewish descent, as Professor Chamberlain says? Are there any scholars in England or the United States who believe this?"

My answer that Jesus' mother was undoubtedly a Jewess came as a disappointment. But a German man of science protested that the spirit of Jesus is Aryan even though His *leib* (body) born of Mary was Jewish. This query itself shows to what an extent Jewry is disliked in Central and Southeastern Europe. The preju-

dice against the Jews is so strong in Budapest that no more students of that race are allowed in the university than the percentage of the Jewish population to the population of the country as a whole. Furthermore, no Jew is permitted to study who has had anything to do with Bolshevism, because Bela Kun (whose real name is Cohen) bled the people white when he was in power. "I do not know what I am to do. One-half of our students are Jewish!" exclaimed the rector of a leading university.

On the other hand, the prevailing type of Christianity in Southeastern Europe does not appeal to earnest Jews. One who was baptized said to me: "My people will never accept a Christianity later than the time of Bar Kopa because since then so much of Alexandrine philosophy and Roman superstition have entered the religion that we cannot accept it." He was pleased when I told him that the Christianity of John and Paul and other first century Christians was adequate. He said that many of his people in Central and Southeastern Europe would accept that Christianity if it were presented to them.

I was much impressed by the difference between my visit to these lands seven years ago and this visit. The students are far more open to the Christian appeal than formerly. On arrival in Belgrade, we found that, although no notice of our coming had been sent to the press and the posters had been up only two hours, about one hundred and thirty students put in an appearance at our first meeting. The next evening two hundred came to hear me, and at the third meeting three hundred were present, of whom several were women. About one hundred stayed to a second session, and a number expressed a desire to join the Student Movement.

What is greatly needed is the presence of one or two strong leaders who will take advantage of the students' open-mindedness and who will help those who are hungry for reality into a vital life in Christ.

The language barrier was a real one in connection with personal interviews with the students. One man who came to see me knew no English or German and very little French. He had been a communist but became disappointed in Communism as he had seen it in Odessa and Kieff where he had studied. He remarked: "The masses are only machines. I have looked in vain for men of real character. All are led by circumstances instead of mastering circumstances." He had no ideal in life, had lost in the battle for personal purity, and had thought of committing suicide.

In Bulgaria there flamed up a decided spirit of enthusiasm. My first public meeting was held in the largest hall in the university. Every seat was taken, and several persons stood throughout my address. Seldom have I received better attention, and about one hundred remained for a second meeting, at which questions were put. It was a wonderful session, and God's presence was very manifest during the two hours I remained with the students. The next evening I spoke in the medical lecture room of the university. Again every seat was filled, and in spite of extra seats being brought in many stood throughout the address. This meeting lasted three hours. Another evening I preached in the Protestant church of which my interpreter was the pastor. Several questions on fundamentals were asked. One man wanted to know what separated the two hundred million Slavs from British and American Christians; in his opinion if only money

could be abolished all people would be united and world reconstruction would follow.

Other questions asked in Bulgaria included: Is God personality or an abstract idea? What is the great law of life? Does the law of Karma exist? In what period of development does humanity find itself now? Many times have I had cause to be thankful for the years which I spent in India, in that the experience gained there helped me to reply to such thoughtful, philosophical, and religious queries. Is God personality or an abstract idea? The answer to this query has sent men a-questioning down the ages. Personality is higher than the impersonal. Man has personality. Thus man would be superior to God if God were only an abstract idea. Men find God (as James puts it) *in rebus*. As Cato expressed it, "That He is, all Nature cries aloud." It is this personal God that Jesus came to reveal as Father. "A God who could not speak would not be rational, and a God who would not speak could not be moral." So if Deity is both rational and moral we must expect a revelation from Him. This revelation is given in Jesus, who became flesh and dwelt among men who beheld His glory.

Two other questions constantly came up during the discussions: What is the source of evil and suffering? and, What is the meaning of the existence of evil? It is St. John who says: "This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." In the mineral and vegetable kingdoms law must be followed. Animals also are under the compelling power of the law of instinct, but man is higher in the scale of being, having option, choice, selection. Of what avail is choice unless he is permitted to choose? Granted choice,

there is the possibility of choosing wrongly. This man has done, and in the wake of this choice came suffering and evil. The late Professor James Denney has well said: "There is in truth only one religious problem in the world—the existence of sin; and one religious solution of it—the atonement in which the love of God bears the sin, taking it, in all its terrible reality, for us upon itself."

Close upon this searching after the source of evil comes the plaintive plea of the students to determine in how far should young men lead clean lives. One said: "Can I lead a pure life without its injuring me physically?" Social considerations also fill a large place in the moral thinking of European students to-day, and questions were asked as to what kinds of leaders are needed in the world. The complaint of the Balkan student, that "all are led by circumstances," shows the urgency of pointing out sound principles of character building. All the men and women who want to be masters of their lives and to have strength to lay beneath the work of the world must ask God that discipline be given to them. Unless one passes under the discipline of a wiser and stronger hand at the beginning, he will never come to the time of deliberate and moral self-discipline which alone is character. "For this only is character—the building of life beneath the firm sovereignty of the principle that is the heart of God." If nations do not realize this, they will pay heavily for their future. There is no freedom outside of character. The struggle for social good and the perfecting of human life is fundamentally a struggle for the triumph of ideals in personal wills. God can take hold of men only in man. Witness three lives which I have had occasion to see used mightily by the Lord.

A Balkan man who was absolutely outside of the Christian fold, an agnostic, was converted, and only five months later went as a representative of his country to a Christian Student conference held in a neighboring land. Another, a brilliant woman, whose mind was turned to the Christian faith last spring, lectured last autumn in the *Université Libre* on The Philosophy of Christianity, explaining in a most stimulating way, from the point of view of her own critical philosophy, that great fact which, as she said, was the touchstone of what was Christianity and what was not—the identity of Christ with God. Still another, a young man who had listened to my address upon *Moralische Atrophe* in Vienna before the war, had gone into the trenches, had met the great Christ, and being shot and invalided back to Vienna managed to find his way to the Student Christian Movement headquarters where he was eventually made vice-chairman. After the Armistice he was called to a secretaryship of the Student Christian Movement, and last spring was doing evangelistic work in Southeastern Europe.

There is great economic distress in Southeastern Europe. The average income in Hungary has multiplied seven to eight times since before the war, but the cost of living has multiplied one hundred times. If prices in America were to rise in the same proportion as they have in Hungary, I was told by the World's Student Christian Federation agent for student relief, it would be necessary to pay \$100 for a hat, \$200 for a pair of shoes, and \$1,000 for a suit of clothes. In the winter of 1920-1921 people lived in a thousand railroad cars in Budapest, since they could find no other dwellings. One evening I knocked upon the door of such a car; it was opened by a woman of evident refinement, whose

husband it turned out had been a government official and whose son was a student. Although the summers were passable, they suffered intensely in winter because of the cold. It is said that eighty per cent. of the students in Austria had an income below the existence minimum. In the winter of 1920-1921 sixty per cent. could not study in their lodgings, because there was neither light nor heat in them. In Czechoslovakia and in Poland also there is great need. I rejoice in the efforts being put forth to secure help from American students for the suffering students of Southeastern and Central Europe.

It was constantly borne in upon me that we must continue this student relief, by witnessing such scenes as the following. In Budapest I visited a building occupied by one hundred and eleven men students, and found three rooms with sixteen men crowded in each, one room with fifteen men in it, and so on. The bedding was changed only once in five or six weeks. A short time before my arrival there were only twenty sheets for those one hundred and eleven students, and only one washroom for them all. In a women students' hostel in the same city there were twenty college girls sleeping in a single room, in which one girl had died just before my arrival. Their breakfast consisted of nothing more than a slice of black bread. They could also have obtained a cup of coffee, but the place where it was served was so far away from the dormitory that most were satisfied with only the piece of bread, which they took to their rooms the night before. One girl had stockings with no feet in them, merely a strip of string to hold the stocking in position under the instep. She also had only one undergarment, one dress, and one blanket, but no pillow.

The students in this part of Europe still constitute a direct appeal to international philanthropy. The challenge has been accepted by the members of the World's Student Christian Federation to the extent that, after a visit by a Federation representative to Vienna in February, 1920, an appeal was made for the relief of needy students. Immediately, in March, 1920, operations were begun; and during the summer of that year, at the St. Beatenberg Conference, a decision was taken to launch a student relief program for needy students of the Baltic States, Poland, Germany, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Hungary, and Asia Minor, and for foreign students in France and Switzerland. The autumn of 1920 saw the beginnings of an enlarged relief operation in Austria, and with the coming of the new year the same took place in Poland, Germany, and Hungary.

By this time the American Relief Administration offered to assume responsibility for student feeding in the Baltic States, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland, giving the Federation more scope to begin operations in Esthonia and Asia Minr. By April, 1921, a full program was in swing in all relief areas. On the occasion of my visit I found that a daily breakfast was being served to 6,400 students in Austria. In Germany supplementary food was furnished for a daily meal to 20,000. Besides this, clothing, book, housing, self-help schemes are in operation and undergoing continual enlargement in all countries. In Hungary I found that the leaders of this wonderful movement had not forgotten the professors, who were being helped to secure clothing at greatly reduced prices.

Any one who has had the opportunity to glance in at the *mensas* where the students assemble to eat, will appreciate the mention of concrete gifts which are being

sent out in the relief program, flour, sugar, condensed milk, cocoa, corned beef, bacon, lard, as well as suits of clothing, dresses, sweaters, overcoats, stockings, and shoes. In Hungary cocoa is sold to students for twenty kronen a kilo, which is two and one-fifth pounds, whereas in the shops it costs one hundred and fifty kronen per kilo. Students line up at the hostels for their cup of cocoa and slice of bread, which forms a breakfast, and they relish their cocoa even if it is drunk from a cup made of a condensed milk can. Happy are they to have bare tables and few utensils rather than go hungry. For the convalescents supplementary feeding is fortunately provided. This relief, which is so wide-spread and salutary, is administered impartially, without regard to race, nationality, creed or any other criterion than proven need. From October 1, 1920, to June 30, 1921, a sum of 3,061,208.99 Swiss francs was contributed by twenty or more well-favored nations to feed a dozen hungry ones. In my judgment it is absolutely essential that this relief should be continued this spring to the deserving and struggling students of these lands.

But pressing as are these physical needs, there are even more urgent needs waiting to be filled. I refer to the moral requirements of these fiercely tempted people. It is wonderful how they listen when Christ is presented to them. In Budapest hundreds of students under the leadership of the State Secretary of Education crowded into their largest hall to hear us. I shall never forget the response from that great audience when I spoke of Jesus Christ as the only hope of international peace and individual redemption. I pointed out how education had failed, economics had failed, and civilization itself had failed; and then I urged them to give the great Christ an opportunity. Never have I

had such a response in any country. The audience applauded until it became embarrassing. There seemed on their part a great longing and hope that possibly Christ might lift them out of their difficulties, individual, social, and international.

The next afternoon I gave a Gospel address on the power of sin and the power of Christ. Five hundred students gathered to hear me, and when I gave the invitation three hundred stayed for a second meeting. The following afternoon we met for four hours in another hall, where every seat was taken and where many of my auditors stood. For one hour I elaborated on the theme, *The Uniqueness of Christ*. Then there was an interval of a few minutes, after which I continued for another hour on *The Bible*. During this second hour also every seat was taken and students remained standing. This was followed by an appeal from the chairman of the Student Christian Association, and eighty-one students gave their names and addresses as desiring to join Bible classes. Sixty-four of these were men and seventeen were women. The last hour we made plans for the future, and their questions and personal interviews gave me a clear insight into the working of the minds of these earnest seekers after Light.

In one of the Balkan countries a professor forty years of age said, after attending one of my meetings: "This is the first time in my life I have listened to an address on morals." A second professor said: "I feel for my poor country, and I want the youth to have the high moral sentiments which Americans have."

The sad moral aspects of these lands can be explained to a large degree by the many years of war through which the people have passed, and by the fact

that some of these nations have been under Turkish rule. There is need of hope and the building of good character. The city of Vienna, in fact, has become so hopeless, that a student remarked: "If a man with hope in his face walks down the street, people will stop and look at him because he is such an exception to the rule." Farther south, in Serbia, Bishop Nicolai expressed his opinion of the blight of war and its devastating effect upon character formation of the young, by saying: "You have helped Europe to stop her war, but the war is not yet finished—the war in Europe now in almost every soul. The children are the only hope of Europe. But they must be educated. If you leave them to the same spirit as their fathers you are feeding and supporting three million soldiers and not three million Christians."

In these countries there is much religious ferment. In the Orthodox Church of Serbia I found a movement to use modern instead of ancient church Slavonic in church services, so that the common people might understand the words of the liturgy, and there are some leaders, like Bishop Nicolai, who are a real spiritual force within their church. In Bulgaria also there is complete religious freedom, and last spring a national church council of the Orthodox Church was convened, attended by three hundred delegates, to unify different elements in the church, to shorten the liturgy, to change the language employed from ancient to modern, to encourage priests to preach sermons, to allow priests who are widowers to remarry, and so on. This is the first council of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church since 1871, and although nothing of great importance was accomplished in the way of religious reform, the situation is more hopeful than before.

In Czechoslovakia since the war a *Los vom Rom* movement has started; and it is thought two million, including many priests, have left the Roman Church. Some have turned to the Protestant church, others to the Orthodox, Bishop Gorazde of Bohemia being sent up by Serbia to lead into the latter church some of this seething mass of people who are expressing their unrest and groping towards something better. The greater part of the number, about one million, have formed the Czechoslovak National Church, which combines Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox ideas; the mass is observed, for instance, but the Pope is not acknowledged. When this church was formed its bishops were consecrated by the Serbian Orthodox Church. As for those who have sought the Protestant church, they number at the most about two hundred thousand.

My feeling is that America's great contribution religiously towards the solution of the problems in Southeastern Europe, should be in the main along the following lines:

First. Prayer, intelligent, earnest, and unceasing; for God alone can prevent the outbreak of another war in that part of Europe—a war which many think will come within twenty years. He alone can quicken the churches which have to a great extent lost their hold on the educated classes.

Second. It is my conviction that American churches should send some of their ablest evangelists and apologetic speakers to labor on an interdenominational basis, to win to Christ these discouraged and discontented people. They will welcome us if convinced that we are not come to proselyte, but to present Jesus Christ to them as their Saviour and Friend. What we have

done and are doing to bring them physical relief will incline them to listen to our spiritual appeals.

Third. I believe that we should seek to establish one or more interdenominational Bible schools in this part of Europe. The ignorance of the Bible in these lands is pathetic. A fourth year Roman Catholic student in Vienna told me that he never had in his possession a New Testament until my visit. Such Bible schools could train students and other leaders for Christian work among their fellow countrymen, as well as be of great service as centers of evangelism.

Fourth. The establishment of a few free scholarships in theological seminaries of North America would be of great service. This would enable the best of these foreign students to study theology here and to see our North American church life. They could then return to lead their own churches into a purer and stronger Christianity.

Fifth. It is my conviction that we could furnish financial help to indigenous churches possessing life and power. There are a number of such Protestant churches in Southeastern Europe. If an earnest Christian propaganda is not carried on now in Southeastern Europe, many will turn to theosophy and spiritism, since large numbers are weary of materialism.

Throughout this tour I had many evidences to prove the truth of a statement published by Mr. Lloyd George and the other prime ministers of the British Commonwealth of Nations. In it occur these significant words: "The co-operation which the League of Nations explicitly exists to foster will become operative in so far as the consenting people have the spirit of good will. The spirit of good will among men rests on spiritual forces. The hope of a brotherhood of humanity reposes on the

deeper spiritual fact of the Fatherhood of God. In the recognition of the fact of that Fatherhood and of the Divine Purpose for the world which are central to the message of Christianity, we shall discover the ultimate foundation for the reconstruction of an ordered and harmonious life for all men."

NEW YORK.

THE REVIEW

CURRENT THOUGHT AND ACTIVITY

THERE IS BEGINNING TO ARISE IN THE CHURCH A CALL FOR THE prophet as distinguished from the preacher. There are faithful, courageous, zealous, intelligent preachers, but few if any of them function as the hoped for prophet must do, if he comes with the mighty, upheaving message for which a troubled age awaits. Will he come?

In addition to the elemental virtues and gifts demanded in the preacher, the prophet must have a surpassing moral comprehension of his time, and that unshakable faith in the sovereign remedy for the world's disease that gives his utterance an overwhelming, inescapable power of conviction. All through the church devout, self-sacrificing preachers are putting their very lives into their work, only to be heartbroken at the results. They may be occasionally cheered by substantial accessions to the membership, but they cannot ignore the spiritual apathy of society at large. The church is chilled by it, so that its work drags, and the preacher must devote altogether too much of his strength to stirring up the members to keep things going.

One difficulty is that, regardless of the theology, spirituality, or gifts of the preacher, as he is usually found, his utterance has rather the intellectual than the moral cast. This does not mean that he ranks, or seeks to rank, as an intellectual, but that his thought finds its outlet by way of the analytic, dialectic, or even dogmatic channel. He preaches as one who has learned truth rather than experienced it. He prays more than he communes; he believes more than he feels; he convinces more than he convicts; he informs more than he arouses.

But men, both individually and in the mass, are aroused and moved to action through strong appeal directly to feeling—a fact distasteful to the leadership of an intellectual age, but a

fact none the less. Moreover, it seems impossible to reach effectively the inner feeling, the very heart, of humanity in general by way of the reasoning powers. There is in man a capacity for moral response, susceptible to direct impression, a distinct spiritual intuition, and it is the unique function of the prophet to knock resoundingly at just this door. His is the categorical rather than the dogmatic or logical appeal.

Writing in *The Century Magazine*, upon *A Famine of Prophets*, Miles H. Krumbine, a Dayton, Ohio, pastor, takes up from the historical standpoint the question as to why we lack prophets in this age, and these extracts disclose his view:

"Why have we no prophets? There are numerous minor reasons. Our leaders, accepted and recognized as such, are usually men in official positions. Discretion and tact are requisite to successful administration. That at once precludes the development of prophetic powers."

"But there is an important historic reason why we have no prophets. The history of the origin of the Christian sermon, a very thorough account of which is to be had in *'The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church,'* by Dr. Edwin Hatch, is instructive. In the primitive church preaching was unknown. Instead of the preacher, the church had the prophet. His function was not that of prediction, but of spontaneous utterance. 'He preached because he could not help it, because there was a divine breath breathing within him which must needs find utterance.' It is in this sense only that the prophets of the early church were preachers.

"Inevitably, Christianity made contacts with the Greek world. In the process of interpenetration that followed, Christianity both gave and took. One of the things it gave up was 'prophesying'; one of the things it took from the Greek world was that which became the Christian sermon.

"There was in the Greek world that Christianity entered a species of public lecturers known as sophists. The subjects of these sophists were usually morality or theology. They preached what we would call 'sermons.' Robed in a special gown, seated on an elevated professorial chair, before an audience called either by personal invitation of the lecturer or by regular enrolment, the sophist would discourse in the most refined rhetorical forms on these vital themes. His discourses were frequently interrupted by applause or by shouts of 'Bravo!' 'Wonderful!' 'Divine!'"

"It is not beyond the reach of the imagination to suppose that, if we could develop within the church a 'preaching order' made up of men who are relieved of the burden of organization and routine and are expected to furnish intelligent, daring, consecrated leadership according to the Gospel of Jesus, such a 'preaching order' might well become a new race of prophets who, like the prophets of the primitive church, preached by 'spontaneous utterance.'"

THE PROTESTANT CHURCHES APPEAR TO BE DRIFTING INTO that species of teaching that is condemned upon the principle that erroneous ideas are dangerous, not through what they affirm, but because of what they deny or ignore. Paul, whose theological views long enjoyed great influence, was content to say: "I am determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified." But if one keeps himself fairly informed upon the utterances of many of our pulpits and the burden of much of our Christian literature, he can hardly avoid the impression that somehow the great central doctrine of the Atonement is being quietly and unobtrusively edged to one side, and, in some instances, has been completely discarded.

It is properly a chief function of a quarterly like this to mirror the thoughts, teachings, activities, and attitudes of the leadership of our churches, even where conflicting views of various sections of the church are given in order that tendencies in weighty questions may be made clear. It is with no conscious prejudice respecting the institutions or churches involved that there are submitted such quotations as this recent editorial in *The Lutheran*, given here almost in full:

"A booklet, entitled 'The Fellowship of Prayer,' has been issued under the auspices of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ, which, under the general theme, 'The Working Out of Redemption,' outlines daily helps for devotions during the Lenten Season. A text, a Scripture reading, a seed thought, a suggested line of thought for meditation and prayer, constitute the daily menu. The ground to be covered is indicated by the following subheads: Redemption Announced, the Redeemer Revealed, Welcoming the Redeemer, Following the Redeemer,

Stewards of Redemption, Experiencing Redemption, and the Victorious Redeemer.

"The theme of Redemption is that upon which the thoughts of Christians should be riveted during this season, and it is a great step in advance to find churches that hitherto ignored the observance of Lent ready to pay some regard to the great facts that cluster around the closing period of our Saviour's life. The Congregationalist Commission on Evangelism issues a similar booklet, giving suggestions for 'Lenten Sermons and Addresses.' We have carefully read both. We have felt ourselves to be in a new and strange atmosphere. * * * It breathes the spirit of a new gospel which is *not* the Gospel of the Scriptures. It is not so much what is said as what is left unsaid that brings us to this conclusion. Many points on the circumference of the great fact of Redemption are touched upon, but they have no relation to the center. We were reminded forcibly of what Dr. Schmank once wrote in his student days: 'We believe in circumferences, but we must first find and possess ourselves of a center; then only may we say that there can be no true center without a circumference.' Here we are face to face with a theology that has shifted clean away from the great center—the *atoning death of Jesus Christ*. Let us specify.

"Only once is the word 'atonement' used, and in the following fashion on page 15: 'Whatever my understanding of the atonement, I may be sure of this, that if I have welcomed the Christ as the dominant spirit of my life, I am saved.' Here the burden of man's salvation is plainly shifted away from Christ's atoning death and placed upon man. In other words, man saves himself by welcoming Christ as the dominant spirit of his life. We need not go to Rome to learn how to save ourselves; we now have this doctrine in a modern dress in the Protestant Church itself. In both the booklets named, nothing appears that would put us in a mood to sing the old hymn, 'Rock of Ages.' The suggested devotional hymns on pages 16 and 17 (of which there are 16) are absolutely barren of Atonement thought and full of the sentiment of salvation by works. Briefly, through both booklets runs the thought that in working out redemption, Christ has led the way and all we have to do is to follow after. Christ is our Model only, not our Sacrifice, 'without the shedding of whose blood there is no remission of sin.' We see Christ on the Cross, and all it means to us is that we too must bear our cross and follow after Him. We 'admire Christ's service and sacrificial suffering' and become like Him.

Need we wonder that many of our soldier boys in giving up their lives made a sacrifice that differed in no essential respect from that which Christ made on the Cross?

"The very fact that a quotation from Harry Emerson Fosdick appears as a seed-thought in every day's devotions is evidence that the booklet is made to voice the salvation-by-works doctrine of the New Theology. We cannot believe that it represents the faith of the great mass of Presbyterians, Baptists and Methodists, and it is to be hoped that the evangelical faith and spirit will find a voice and speak in no uncertain tones against this evasion of the great fact of the Atonement, on which alone man's salvation must be based. Wesley, Spurgeon, the Hodges and the Alexanders, Moody and a host of other preachers would turn in their graves at such vague and evasive teachings on the subject of Redemption as the following:

"The condition which makes it possible for the spirit of Christ to work out a person's redemption is primarily the desire of that person to have Christ for a friend."

"Loyalty gives faith power to dominate the whole life, thus working redemption."

"If my share of redemptive power is small, I may increase it by giving some of it to others. Without doing this, Jesus himself could not have been saved.' (! ! !)

"(Fear not; only believe. Luke 8:50.) 'If I have been agonizing to manufacture, as it were, a redeemed life, let me now see that redemption is a flower that grows from planting a living seed in prepared soil; the spirit of God in a willing heart.'

"What underlies this subtle evasion of the Scripture teaching on the Atonement? The last quotation suggests the answer. Agonizing for salvation as Augustine, Luther and hosts of the great lights in the Church have done, because they were under deep conviction of sin and felt their need of redeeming grace, is spoken of as 'manufacturing a redeemed life.' Whom these New Theologists have in mind, we admit, are certain emotionalists who try to work themselves up into a state of feeling which they call conversion, and not such agonizers as Augustine and Luther; but it is plain that they have no place for conviction of sin. And there is the real root of their failure to appreciate the need of an all-sufficient Atonement. They speak of sin as 'blight,' as 'disease,' as a disturbance of the normal life of the soul, not as that awful damnable thing that sets man at enmity with God and burdens the conscience with a load of guilt that invites the wrath and punishment of a just and holy God.

Man is a child of God notwithstanding, and all he needs is to be assured that God loves him and his calling and election are sure. No need of an accounting. No need of real repentance. No need of the Atonement. And so the whole structure on which the Gospels and the Epistles build the hope of salvation falls to pieces. We are saved, not by what Christ suffered on the cross, but by imitating Him. Repentance is not fleeing from sin and its condemnation and taking refuge in the wounds of Christ; it is merely 'turning to God under the warmth of Christ's love,' we are told. Verily something has gone wrong with our Protestant Christianity and we have a cheap salvation."

IT IS ASTONISHING THAT MANY PREACHERS SEEM TO FEEL THAT they must go outside the Bible for sermon subjects that will hold their people. In cases where the congregation is not held by preaching based on and saturated with the Scriptures the difficulty must be with the preacher. The Bible has the supreme answer to the great needs of the soul, and the souls of every congregation have their needs. The task is, to reveal these and then to apply the remedy. Instances are constantly occurring that show what the Scriptures can do without any earthly interpreter; how much more can they accomplish when a consecrated, able, and sympathetic man gives himself chiefly to the great work of opening them to the needy. President Alessandri of Chile is an example of the effect of devout and persistent reading of the Bible, as shown by this statement he is reported to have made to a visitor:

"I may tell you that the only book I have in my bed chamber is the Bible. I read it every day and try to make it my guide. Don't understand that I am a Protestant, for I am not. Neither am I a Catholic. But I believe I am a true Christian. And for this reason I believe that I will succeed in my reform program. I believe that your country is great, not because you are great business people, and organize great business enterprises, but you are able to succeed in these things because you are a Bible reading people. I want Chile to follow your example in this matter that we also may be truly great."

FOR SOME TIME THERE HAS BEEN A MORE OR LESS INDECISIVE discussion as to the number of theological students in our semi-

naries, and concerning the prospects as to the future supply of preachers. The Record has given the exhaustive survey of the whole situation respecting the seminaries, made by Conrad Henry Moehlman, and we are indebted to The Christian Century for the condensation of it quoted below.

In addition to seminary statistics it would seem to be of fully equal importance to know something of the personal characters, qualifications, and force of the men the seminaries are sending out. Will they be merely conventional preachers, able to deliver proper discourses on Sunday, to make pastoral calls, and to fulfill all the perfunctory duties of the ministry in a more or less satisfactory way? Or will a goodly proportion of them be men with a burning message, and such a conception of the obligations and privileges of their calling that their zeal will kindle their congregations into an unquenchable desire to know our Lord and to do His will? But we must return to Mr. Moehlman's figures:

"He shows that in 1916 there were 12,051 students in institutions reporting to the government, and that in 1918 this number had decreased to 9,334, representing a loss of 2,697 students. In the same period the attendance at the law schools of the country decreased 56 per cent; medical students, 6 per cent; dental students, 22 per cent; pharmacy students, 33 per cent. The college graduates of the country in that period declined 13 per cent. It is evident that all educational processes lagged, particularly the training of professional men in graduate courses. Mr. Moehlman has made a series of graphs to indicate the total number of theological students in the country each year since 1870 up to 1915. In that period the Protestant students have increased from 2,499 to a high mark of 9,125. From 1890 to 1900 the number was almost stationary, and from 1900 to 1905 there was a loss. The ten years from 1905 to 1915 represents the period of largest growth in the theological student body of any in the entire history. Then the war brought a reaction. It is interesting to note that Roman Catholic theological institutions fell off from 1900 to 1905 just as Protestant institutions did. The statistics indicate that the falling off in Protestant enrollment is largely among the short course men, a fact that would hardly have been guessed by the various observers. Since many of the theological schools take only graduates

and the process of making college graduates has been slowed up, it will take theological schools longer to get back to normalcy than it has the liberal arts colleges."

AN APPEAL SENT OUT A SHORT TIME AGO FOR MEANS TO FEED the starving millions of Eastern Europe contained these words: "The world's life has never been saved by some one giving of his surplus. Its saviors have always been those who have given of their very life."

By a singular coincidence these words have been solemnly verified by a call from another source in behalf of the same region. The latter came from the General Secretary of the Near East Relief, and included an extract from his annual report. From this are taken the few lines below recounting the cost in health and life paid by those who are giving themselves to this great work. When one turns from such facts as these and looks out upon the pleasure-loving, wasteful, extravagant crowds of any great city in America, all our boasted generosity seems trivial. How many Americans know what sacrifice for the world's suffering really is? We think, because we have given a trifle, and thereby registered our approval of a great work, that our full duty in the matter is done, and we are now free to resume our pursuit of the decent pleasures of life. But here is what the General Secretary said about our heroic workers in those regions of agony:

"I never return from the Near East without a renewed appreciation of the heroism of the men and women who are making possible this life-saving service. The medals which our executive committee voted last spring to be given to these workers, have to me now an appropriateness which I never before fully realized. On this trip our party visited and placed a floral tribute, as well as conducted a simple service, at the grave of Miss Edith Winchester, who went out on the *Leviathan*, and after her arrival at Erivan, having volunteered for especially dangerous work with contagious disease, died within a few days, before she received her first letters from home. I then reviewed the somewhat long and lengthening list of other workers who have unhesitatingly given their lives in this service, many of whom could have spared themselves and lived had they chosen

the easier course. There are scores of workers today, in the interior of Anatolia, Harpoot and other places, as well as in Armenia, who have not had letters from home for many months and who expect throughout the coming winter to be entirely cut off from communication with the outside world. Several of these fine American men and women, college graduates and from our best homes, are now suffering from trachoma, contracted in spite of all their precautions while caring for the thousands of infected children. They are paying a price that puts to shame the biggest financial offering of the American public, but they do it gladly, for they have the thrill and the joy of service, and there is not one of them that would trade jobs with their friends in America who have larger material and social advantages but not so large a field of service."

A MAN CANNOT HOPE TO GAIN THE FAVOR OF GOD MERELY AS A return for his own righteousness, it is true; nevertheless He that promised is faithful, and godliness is still profitable for the life that now is. This is so, not only because obedience places one in a position when he can consistently pray for divine help, but also because righteousness is in harmony with that certain balance of things that sin disturbed, and wherever righteousness is restored its fruits appear, and that, too, in temporal as well as in spiritual affairs.

Of late much interest has been taken in a particular case of the application of the Golden Rule in the manufacturing business. The house concerned is the A. Nash Co., clothing manufacturers, Cincinnati. The principle was applied, not only to the relations of employer and employees, but also to those of the manufacturer and customers. This "experiment," as the President of the company, Mr. Arthur Nash, calls it, came as the result of his conviction that the so-called failure of Christianity was, in reality, the failure of the lack of Christianity. In an address before the recent annual meeting of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, Mr. Nash in part described the working of the principle as follows:

"The year 1919, the initial year of our experiment, will go down in history as the year of strikes, industrial upheavals and war. This was especially true in the clothing and textile indus-

tries. The clothing industry, which had been known as the sweatshop of underpaid, underfed pauper labor, was the industry into which we had decided to introduce the Golden Rule.

"You also remember that during 1919 the one complaint of the entire industry was, no production. You also remember that clothing mounted to unheard of prices.

"The year 1920 was ushered in with the same conditions in control, but conditions soon changed, and there was a period of stagnation in the textile and clothing business, of non-buying, cancellation of orders, some factories running part time, others closing down entirely, and still others being forced into the hands of receivers.

"But during the year of strikes the A. Nash Company had no strikes. During the year of nonproduction the A. Nash Company increased their production over 1,000 per cent. During the year of high prices the A. Nash Company manufactured to order suits and overcoats to retail at from \$16.50 to \$29.00.

"Now, note what happened when stagnation hit the industry. During the first six months of 1920 the A. Nash Company did \$81,000 more business than it did the entire year of 1919, and during the month of June, 1920, it did a business equal to the entire year of 1918. The A. Nash Company was not, at any time during 1920, able to get out its orders on time.

"No, this is not a miracle, except in the sense that acting in harmony with God's law always produces miracles.

"From the day that we decided on this policy of the Golden Rule both our production and volume of business began to increase.

"I wish to add here that while our factory is not unionized, we have the support and confidence of all the union people of Cincinnati.

"During the increase of production and on account of the wonderful loyalty shown by our help we made several increases in wages during 1919. None of these increases were made on account of union demands, or in concert with the market, but each one was based on a certain increase in production which had been previously announced to our help."

THERE IS A DIFFERENCE OF OPINION AS TO HOW FAR THE church should go in endeavoring to improve the relations of capital and labor and to better human society generally. Should it be content to proclaim individual salvation and

religious duty only, or should it grapple directly with public evils? The danger here comes from overemphasis; one extreme tends to provoke the other. It is most unfortunate when great questions, involving all sides of human life, become victims of partisan spirit. The various interests of human nature cannot safely be severed from one another; they are interrelated.

It may not be the duty of the church, as a church, to undertake this or that public reform, by attempting to dictate terms and methods, but it is certainly not the duty of the church to remain silent in the presence of injustice. Mr. Sherwood Eddy has given this outline of the reason for the failure of the Russian Church, which not only ignored the cry of the oppressed, but allied itself with the oppressor. This is taken from an article of his in *The Christian Century*:

"Before the war, I saw the church in Russia powerful and secure, with its gorgeous ritual and beautiful choral services, with its vast wealth, prestige and power. The churches were often thronged with the humble and devout worshipping poor; the cabmen and passersby were crossing themselves before every ikon. The church was the pillar of the state, generous in its charity to the poor, and supported by the ruling classes in apparent prosperity. But I saw that church identify itself with the privileged class, rather than with Christ and the people, finding its support from the autocracy, aristocracy and plutocracy of privilege. It finally became almost an adjunct of the spy system of the police department. Every man who showed dangerous tendencies of independent thought, or a demand for liberty, or for the rights of the poor, was promptly reported for drastic action, and found his way swiftly to prison or banishment. Seventy-five per cent of the people were living in illiteracy, sixty per cent in hovels scarcely fit for beasts. For a thousand years Russia had suffered; for five hundred years it had been victimized by czarism. Yet the church identified itself with the class of privilege and of power.

"Finally we saw the people in revolution turn in blind fury and curse that church and the church's God. Ten millions of men pouring back from the war, with a vast elemental life-hunger and land-hunger, called upon the church and state to give an account of their stewardship, and laid hands upon those who had so long exploited and oppressed them. Men complain

of the materialism, the irreligion, and the present dictatorship of Russia. But where were the present leaders trained and educated? They were trained in the czar's prisons and dungeons, and in banishment in the wastes of Siberia. What religious education did they receive from the church? What had it done for the poor, for the uneducated, for the oppressed? It had given paternal 'charity' but not justice."

ABOUT THE MOST TROUBLESOME THING IN THE WORLD IS A SUPPRESSED truth; it will not stay suppressed. Man's realization of his need of God is a truth as old as the race, an inherent element of human nature. Attempts to suppress its outward expression never succeed; rather, in the long run, they only make the principle more clear.

Reports from Russia continue to make it evident, that the failure of the church to proclaim righteousness with sufficient power to save Russia from revolution and disaster, and the later persecution of the church by Bolshevism have both failed to suppress the Russian's faith in his religion. With things tumbling about their ears for a time, many may have looked at the church with dismay, even suspicion or hatred, but the great instincts of mankind have the power of perpetual survival, and now the church in Russia seems to be regaining power. It is to be devoutly hoped that the church itself will be purified by the fire it has passed through. The Chicago Herald and Examiner has printed this account from Russia of a great religious reaction there:

"Cumulative reports from various parts of Russia tell of a rapidly growing religious reaction from the atheistic and irreligious bolshevist doctrines. In some sections it is reported this movement is almost becoming phenomenal from the standpoint of mass psychology. Leaders of the communist parties are complaining that large numbers are being swept away by this reborn religious wave. The people are returning to the churches, are again being married in the churches and having their children baptized, all of which was done away with by the communists as 'unnecessary' and superstition. The bolshevist press is thundering loudly at the church, but the position of the church has been so strengthened by the new religious movement that the communists are chary about resorting to rigorous measures."

WHATEVER THE DUTY OF THE GOVERNMENT AS TO THE IMMIGRATION question, it is certain that the government cannot do all that is needed to solve the problem of our unassimilated millions. Take the case of the Russians who have come to America in recent years. What contacts have they made, and what impressions have thereby been made upon them? We are so used to seeing the "foreigner" among us that our imaginations are seldom stimulated to the point of putting ourselves in his place and realizing what it means for a family of alien race, speech, religion, and customs, with slight education if not illiterate, to come to this country and enter the struggle for a living. Yet right here is the opportunity of the American Christian as an individual and of his church as an organization.

A country pastor said lately that he had found a lone Slav family in his village, and so he called one day. In the conversation he expressed his interest in the welfare of these people just beginning to speak English, and emphasized his desire to be a friend. To his amazement the head of the family, a great powerful fellow, began to sob like a baby. Then the preacher learned that he himself was the first one to show any care whatever for the comfort of these lonely souls.

There is a great collective tragedy in the accounts of hopes, fears, disappointments, loneliness, and sufferings of Russians who have come among us. Such experiences develop a bitterness and desperation that render one an easy prey to radical propaganda. Mr. Jerome Davis, author of *Bolsheviks or Brothers*, gives one experience which is illuminating:

"With the authorization of the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Mr. Post, I visited Russian prisoners in Detroit and Pittsburgh. Before this I had talked with Russians imprisoned at Ellis Island and Hartford. In my interview I asked each Russian whether, during his stay in America, he had ever met any American who had helped him. I suggested that perhaps there had been some teacher, some boss, some boarding house keeper or worker who had been friendly to him. Out of nearly one hundred and fifty arrested Russians there were only five who had ever met any such help. Of these American friends two had been workmen, two had been company doctors and one had been

a teacher. On the other hand, all the others had met many who had cursed them, foremen who had called them 'Russian swine,' bosses who were continually swearing at them. America, according to their stories, had been for the most part one constant struggle against bad industrial conditions and exploitation."

He also gives this item as to the religious state of the Russian workingmen, which is full of suggestiveness to the evangelical church in America:

"A Russian orthodox priest in Brooklyn told me that seventy-five per cent. of the Russian workmen are opposed to the church, although they believe in God. Indeed, one of the outstanding facts regarding the Russian workmen is that while they are skeptical about the church, they still worship in their hearts the divine personality, whom they feel the church does not honestly represent and serve."

BELGIUM IS SO OVERWHELMINGLY ROMAN CATHOLIC THAT WE do not ordinarily associate Protestantism with that country. However, it would appear that the little group of Protestants in Belgium, numbering some 40,000—said just to equal the number of monks and nuns—is far from inactive. The war to a certain extent seems to have produced a condition more favorable to Protestant work than existed before, and this church, though so feeble in numbers, is swift to profit by opportunity. From a brief account of the situation, contributed to *The Continent*, by F. Buse, Secretary *Union des Eglises Protestantes Evangeliques de Belgique*, is taken this extract:

"Two Protestant churches, the 'Union des Eglises Protestantes Evangeliques' and the 'Eglise Chretienne Missionnaire,' work in Belgium. They labor in fraternal sympathy, maintain joint committees for foreign missions and may be called sister churches. There was a time during the reformation of the sixteenth century when Protestants were more numerous than Roman Catholics. A book published recently in Holland quotes the names of 600 Belgian Protestant ministers who lived in Belgium at that time. The cruel persecutions under the Duke of Alva compelled thousands of our compatriots to flee to Holland, while hundreds of others gave their lives for the sake of the gospel.

"Belgium has the honor of having given the first two martyrs of the reformation. It was on July 1, 1523, that two converted monks, Henri Vols and Jean von Esschen, were burnt to ashes at the Grand Place of Brussels. In two years the fourth centenary of this event will be commemorated, and a monument will be erected to remind the present generation of the noble example and courage of the two martyrs.

"There are today about fifty congregations of Protestants in Belgium and fifty ministers, only fifteen of whom, however, are of Belgian nationality. The others have come from France, Switzerland and Holland. It should be borne in mind that, in addition to French, there is another language spoken in Belgium—the Flemish, which is almost identical with the Dutch.

"The Church of Rome seems to have lost some of its power since the armistice. After having had the majority in parliament for thirty years, it has now lost that advantage. During the war many Belgians who fled from their country went to Holland, Switzerland and England, where they came in close contact with Protestantism. The result was a remarkable liberation from prejudice and false ideas concerning non-Catholics. As another consequence, we may now send our colporteurs through the Flemish districts where they preach the gospel and sell Bibles."

SINCE THE WAR THERE SEEMS TO BE A GREAT STIRRING THROUGHOUT all branches of the Christian church. Activity of all sorts is the order of the day, and this is made the more possible by the apparently increasing readiness of the people to seek religious instruction and leadership. This is, of course, especially true of Europe, where the years of suffering and suspense incline men to look beyond this world for any sure foundation of their hopes. Among the other notable movements is that among the Catholics in France. This The Congregationalist summarizes thus:

"Reports come from many quarters of effective Catholic activity in France. The old hostility to the Catholic Church and indifference to all religion began to pass away before the war. Now, we are told by Viscount Georges d'Avenel, the number of active Catholics has greatly increased. People of all classes are ready and glad to take a conspicuous part in the work of propaganda. This is a definite religious revival, especially notable in the towns. Numerous new religious associations connected with

the church are being founded and extended. M. d'Avenel concludes as the result of a careful investigation of the French dioceses that only seven or eight millions of the entire population 'are wholly out of touch with conformity to the teachings of the Church'. Doubtless a considerable proportion of the eight million may be classed as Protestant. But the revival of religious interest is encouraging."

AMONG ALL OUR AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS NOTHING HAS GIVEN this nation much more honest satisfaction than has her public school system. It has come to be taken so much for granted, however, that our citizens are in danger of forgetting that nothing that righteousness and freedom establish can be sure of safety from all hostile influences and forces. An example of this fact is found in a situation that developed lately in the schools of New York City. It was nothing more nor less than an appeal to the school teachers of the city for contributions to the Knights of Columbus Building Campaign Fund, regardless of the religious persuasion of the individual teachers. The President of the Board of Education, according to a letter that has been published, appointed Dr. O'Shea, associate superintendent of schools, "to work with the heads of other city departments among the employees" for this fund. A school principal was assigned the solicitation of the teachers.

According to The Christian Advocate, which set forth the situation in an editorial from which this condensed account is taken, a letter upon the letter-head of this building campaign, appealing for funds, was received by the teachers. From the comment of the Advocate we take these paragraphs, published the week preceding its announcement that the offensive features of the campaign had been dropped:

"That the public schools should be jealously guarded against sectarian and partisan invasion and exploitation is, or ought to be, a fundamental tenet of Americanism. This principle should rule, not only in the course of study and in the selection of the teaching staff, but all teachers and other employees should be scrupulously protected against any coercion or exaction on the part of any political or ecclesiastical group. In flat defiance of this principle the public school

teachers of New York city are at this very moment under practical compulsion to contribute to a Roman Catholic fund."

"No one familiar with the subtle ways by which the power of the Roman hierarchy is interwoven with Tammany control of the city's payroll need be told that the teachers thus solicited will be 'absolutely free,' as Dr. O'Shea explains, 'to give or to refuse, without feeling that advantage or disadvantage will accrue to them from their action.' For it has been arranged that the name and contribution of every giver shall be reported to the head of the Board of Education on a special blank which is provided. The non-Catholic teacher who fails to divide her wages with the chivalrous Knights will be known. They dare not refuse, and they could not make public protest if they dared. It is safer and cheaper to pay tribute and stay on the payroll than to refuse, though heartsick, and be marked for official displeasure, resulting in delayed promotion—if not in being 'broken,' sooner or later.

"The only avenue of relief from this outrageous perversion of authority on the part of the Mayor is through an explosion of public opinion. We cannot believe that good Catholics, any more than any other fair-minded citizens, Jew or Protestant, would stand for Mr. Hylan's course in making the city's teachers, police, firemen and nurses build club houses for Roman Catholic youth. Some will believe it. Not we—until the event shall prove it. The reason why public opinion has not exploded is because the thing has been conducted in secret."

THE AGGRESSIVE CHARACTER OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE United States is a source of much comment. The question is now being asked, What is to be the future of the Protestant and Catholic relationships in this country? Surely, no one, whatever his faith, wants to see a perpetual quarrel. Mr. P. Whitwell Wilson, American Correspondent of the London Daily News, has referred to the matter in this way in the course of an article:

"It is not in destroying the British Empire and the ideals of American citizenship that the ancient church can hope to win its way amid prevailing secularism, but in the display of Christian piety and happiness. Most unfortunate was the boycott of the Mayflower celebrations and the fulminations against the Puritan Fathers. What happened? President Harding,

with a significance that only Americans can fully appreciate, took his inaugural oath on the Masonic Bible of George Washington, and even though it was six months late visited Plymouth, Massachusetts, there to enforce the traditions of 1620. The real issue today is whether Catholicism, with its developing University at Washington and its increase in wealth if not in numbers, is to be met by a merely secular or civic rejoinder or by a deeper spirituality among Protestants. Is there to be an end to trivial artifices, to dependence on ecclesiastical machinery, to negatives which lead nowhere? Is there to be no gospel or a fuller gospel, no Christ or a nearer Christ? That is the choice before the free churches in this free state."

LOYAL AMERICAN CITIZENS OF NEW YORK ARE BEGINNING TO resent the un-American performances of the city government, that came near denying the freedom of the city to the Prince of Wales, but conferred it upon various members of Sinn Fein, including Mr. De Valera. In the light of such things Dr. Walter Laidlaw has gathered some statistics showing Protestant and Catholic numerical strength in America. A brief condensation is given here.

The Protestant and non-Catholic population is in the majority now, still, with a steady increase of population from the Catholic lands of Europe and the comparatively low birth rate of Americans, there is nothing to prevent our American principles, institutions, and traditions from being supplanted by those of a hopelessly alien type unless a determined stand in their defense is made. Here are some of the figures:

"The Protestant population constitutes 72 per cent, as over against a Catholic population of 15.5 per cent. From 1906 to 1916, the period covered by government census figures, the Catholics had a growth of 10.6 per cent, while the various Protestant bodies grew from 17.4 to 28.2 per cent. Analyzing the sources of Catholic growth, Dr. Laidlaw points out that in the ten years the English speaking Catholic churches grew only 1.5 per cent, while the foreign speaking churches grew 22.1 per cent, indicating that the growth of Catholicism is due to immigration from Catholic countries."

MORMONISM IS NOT MAKING AS MUCH NOISE AS SOME OTHER religious organizations, but is aggressively alive none the less.

It is one of the perils to which America has been and is largely asleep. The Christian Statesman is credited with this account of one of the most recent building enterprises of Mormonism, to which it appends a list of the other edifices of the kind:

"The ninth secret temple of Mormonism was begun early in September, 1921, at Mesa, Arizona. The polygamous prophet Grant selected the site some time ago, and a large group of high dignitaries of the church attended the ground-breaking ceremonies. The church intends to rush this edifice and complete it within a year. It is to cost something more than \$500,000 and is to be the most ambitious piece of architecture in Arizona. The other temples erected by the Mormons are given as follows in the order of their dedication: At Kirtland, Ohio, in 1836; at Nauvoo, Illinois, in 1846; at Salt Lake City, Utah, in 1893; at St. George, Utah; at Manti, Utah; at Logan, Utah; at Cardston, Alberta, Canada; and at Laie, Hawaii. These temples are all secret, not being used for public services but devoted to the administration of endowment rituals and celestial marriage ceremonies with baptisms and marriages for the dead."

ARE MONARCHIES PASSING AWAY PERMANENTLY? THE HISTORY of the past five years might seem to point that way. Russia, Germany, and Austria have dropped out of the list of Europe's hereditary monarchies. But the thing is not yet a certainty. Political affairs are still unstable, and the reactionary elements await only opportunity to swing public impulse their way. One of the most uncertain of all the factors that make history is public opinion. This is illustrated by the situation in Germany, as described by a German newspaper man in *The Atlantic Monthly*. Under the caption, *The German Mind*, Hellmut von Gerlach contributes a thoughtful paper, in which occurs this statement concerning Germany's possible return to a monarchical form of government:

"There is no Bolshevik menace for Germany. But there is a very real reactionary danger. Wilhelm II is dethroned, but Wilhelmism is far from being destroyed.

"If a plebiscite were held in Germany to-day, on the question, Monarchy or Republic? it is very doubtful what the result would be. It is certain that the Socialistic laborers are all Republicans. But they comprise only about two-fifths of the population. In

opposition to them, as a great Monarchistic body, stand the great landowners, the great manufacturers, and the great financiers, the headmasters, the professors, the students, higher officials, and old officers—considerable in numbers, but chiefly to be reckoned with on account of their powerful financial, agricultural, and social influence. Consider that a man like Hugo Stinnes alone controls sixty publications. The decision would lie with the non-Socialist workingmen, peasants, and middle classes which stand between the Socialists and workingmen who are Republicans by conviction and the upper classes who are equally pronounced Royalists. This middle stratum is neither Republican nor Royalist. Politically it is quite inactive. When the situation is doubtful, it is apt to line up with the stronger party. Neither an attack on the Republic, nor a defense of it, can be expected from this direction. To-day it inclines probably more toward the monarchy than toward the Republic—in the first place, because the newspapers which it reads are overwhelmingly anti-Republican, and again because it compares the agricultural conditions to-day (especially taxes and prices) with those of 1914, and says, ‘Conditions were better under Wilhelm.’ These unpolitical people are simply not used to political logic. They make the trustee in bankruptcy responsible for the failure.”

THE IDEA OF CULTURE IS, AMONG WESTERN PEOPLES, ASSOCIATED with what is termed Western civilization. Having, under the influence of Christianity, thrown off superstition sufficiently to use Nature’s resources instead of fearing her, the West has made astounding advances in practical knowledge. But these things alone do not make for culture. Writing in *Christian Work*, Fred B. Smith gives some observations upon Japanese life as he saw it that illustrate this point. After speaking of his impressions of Japanese clubs, he says:

“In most of these clubs I was ill at ease, for my clothes were not so perfectly cut as those of the men to whom I was speaking. By the way, ‘European clothes’ are the common thing in Japan. In audiences numbering from one hundred to four thousand nearly all the men were fitted out in so-called ‘European’ suits of the latest model. I could not but hope that some influence would save the Japanese women from following the trend of the men in this respect. From the standpoint of grace, beauty, modesty and comfort their own are far

superior. I do not believe any half-respectable Japanese woman could be hired to appear in the half-naked costume of the American or European society lady in evening attire. The Japanese woman has some modesty left, the European and American seem to have assassinated theirs.

"I met personalities as finished as found anywhere on earth. Their courtesy makes the ordinary man from the West look like a coarse boor. My wife attended a charming reception in a Japanese home where seven white men were present, three of them so disgracefully drunk that they insulted the entire company.

"I sat at a banquet one night between two men who kept me in constant anxiety by their discussion of history and literature about which I knew but little. I was told that next to the municipal building the public school building was the finest in every town in Japan. I saw many of these myself. Ninety-six per cent. of all the people are literate. Schools and colleges are running full to capacity. There is a nation-wide passion for education."

THE JAPANESE PEOPLE, THEIR HISTORY, CUSTOMS, IDEALS, ambitions, and all things about them have been the source of much study in the past few years, especially on the part of Americans. An index of the importance attached to things Japanese just now is found in the fact that *The Literary Digest* lately devoted a large part of one issue to Japan and her people. On the point of religion there was given among other things this concise statement, from Hamilton Wright Mabie's *Japan To-day and To-morrow*, concerning Shinto, which is one of the two chief native "religions," Buddhism being the other:

"Shinto is no longer a religion; it is a profound national sentiment. It never was a religion, properly speaking; but nature worship was combined with it to satisfy the cravings of primitive worshipers. It has no founder, no creed, no theology, no sacred book; it was a practice or discipline of love and gratitude, of remembrance and of patriotism. The Shinto shrine, in its integrity, is a simple structure of wood, undecorated, with a mirror standing on the altar symbolically enforcing the Greek maxim: 'Know thyself.' The genius of Shinto is national and patriotic; it has no explanation of the mystery of the universe to offer its believers, no code of ethics to impose on them. It

has created myriads of deities, but they have been outside the life of men—more or less vivid personifications of natural forces; its only contact with reality has been its multitudinous apotheoses of men. It has taught one deep and vital truth—the unbroken continuity of a people, the immortality of a race. It has fastened thought on life and banished death in our sense of the word; in the older thought of Japan there were no dead; the nation through all generations was indivisible and undestructible.”

THE HEART CANNOT REMAIN A VACUUM AS TO FAITH. IF ONE can not or does not believe one thing, he must another, either intelligent belief in the truth, or superstition in one or more of its grotesque shapes and shades. One of the great difficulties with the Chinese is that they have developed belief in innumerable demons that are ever ready to injure or destroy them. The editor of *The Chinese Christian Advocate*, Paul Hutchinson, says that it is impossible for a Westerner to comprehend such an atmosphere unless he has lived in it, and he says further:

“In fact he may live in it for years and never realize the hold which it has upon his native neighbors. But it is no exaggeration to say that, to the average Chinese, the air is peopled with countless spirits, most of them malignant, all attempting to do him harm. They hover around every motion of every waking hour, and they enter the sanctity of sleep. An intricate system of circumnavigating them, that makes the streets twist in a fashion to daze Boston’s legendary cow, and puts walls in front of doors to belie the hospitality within, runs through the social order.”

In *Flashlights from the Seven Seas*, William L. Stidger relates an incident which exactly illustrates this fact of Chinese superstition:

“We looked over the green railing of the *Santa Cruz*. The big ship had almost come to a stop, for the engines were still in reverse and the shallow river mud was churned up until the otherwise clear water looked like a muddy pond. The little sampan, full of grinning, naked Chinese coolies was fifty feet away from us, and our American sailors were swearing at them in every language they knew and shaking big, brawny, brown fists in their grinning direction.

“It was considered a joke by the passengers, but it was a

very real thing to these poor ignorant Chinese. One sees this happen everywhere in the Orient. For the Chinaman starts out every morning in his sampan with the worst kind of a River Devil after him. He must rid himself of that Devil. So, when a big ship comes into sight, he waits until its bow is very close and then darts in front of its pathway. The idea is that when a sampan full of Chinamen shoots in front of a big ship the Devil is supposed to follow the ship all that day, and let the Chinese junk or sampan alone.

"To an American mind this seems ridiculous. It seems even humorous. I shall never forget how the passengers laughed when the captain told them why he had had to reverse his engines to keep from crushing the frail Chinese sampan. * * *

"They never start out for a day's work that they are not haunted every minute of that day by a thousand devils, ill-omens, and bad spirits which are constantly hovering about to leap on them and kill them," said a missionary. "The whole Orient is full of the thought of fear!" "

IT IS ASTONISHING HOW MANY EVILS THE PUBLIC FINDS TO CONDEMN for which it is partly, if not largely, responsible. There may be such a thing as a public conscience, but what effect has it when it remains mute and leads to no activity? Every one knows what the great public evils and perils are, just as every one knows that a clean public opinion backed by a determined public will could root them out in short order. But the public conscience is too often content to whimper a protest when it should command righteousness. The case of the public press is one in point. In a recent sermon upon the press, Rev. Edgar DeWitt Jones made this appeal to the devout element of the public, respecting objectionable newspaper matter:

"The morals of the press can rise no higher than the level of public opinion. The men and women who ride downtown on street car or bus are the people that the publishers of a newspaper respect more than the politician, the preacher or the professional reformer. The great army of men and women who make up a city, the multitudes who people store and shop and office and home—this mass or average mind is what the press watches and observes with care and caution. The parents of the average home have it within their power to shape the character of the newspaper that comes into the family circle. Stop

buying the paper that caters to the low and the vicious; that is an effective weapon always. Protest against a peculiarly indecent piece of news or head-line with a call in person or letter to the editor. Such procedure, when it is intelligently done, is welcomed by thoughtful public servants and discerning managers of great and going concerns everywhere. On the whole, most persons are reluctant either to commend or to condemn a newspaper's policy, yet I doubt if there is a journal anywhere that has not a real interest in the opinion of the 'inarticulate' public."

THE FORCES OPPOSED TO PROHIBITION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC continue to belittle as far as possible all that has been accomplished by the Eighteenth Amendment, while violations of the law are reported on every hand. This amendment came at a time when its enforcement must, at first, be more difficult than at any period for years. The whole world seems to be experiencing a great moral let down, following the great tension of the war, and is in an exceptionally bad mood to have any of its desires denied. Hence it is not surprising that even people who in general rank as worthy American citizens see no wrong in secretly ignoring the law against drink, while it is believed that some of the flagrant violators have amassed riches in supplying liquor at exorbitant prices. Still, the facts justify the statement that, despite the difficulties of enforcement, prohibition in this country is a success. Yet its enemies are seeking to control Congress, it is now reported, in order to find some way to nullify the amendment. The Congregationalist outlines certain evidence of the present value of prohibition in this way:

"After two years of Prohibition, although conditions are by no means such as are to be desired, yet they are markedly better than during the years of license. The verdict is justified that though 'still under fire it is slowly winning out.' It is declared that while drunkenness is increasing in other nations it is notably decreasing in the United States. Crimes related to liquor have fallen off over 30 per cent. Juvenile crime of this kind has decreased; accidents caused by liquor have decreased; the increase of insanity has been checked; deaths from alcoholism have decreased. On the other hand savings accounts have increased. More fine hotels have been built during these two

past years than at any previous two years in the history of the country. The evidence that labor has profited is manifold. Prohibition may not be the only cause of these favorable conditions; nor have we named all of the important and desirable results of prohibition, the saving in prison, court, hospital, asylum and similar expenses. It is reported that Boston, in 1917, had 72,897 arrests for drunkenness; in 1921 there were 30,987; Cincinnati, in 1918, had over 14,000 arrests for drunkenness, in 1921, over 500; Milwaukee showed a falling off of more than a thousand in the number of arrests; Washington, D. C., in 1918, had over 10,000 arrests, 1921, over 5,000."

SOME OF US, IT IS TO BE FEARED, ARE SO CUMBERED ABOUT much serving, amid the many insistent demands for Christian activity, that we forget to cultivate the Christian life. Of course, such neglect ultimately exacts its penalty. One will do more for his Lord, in the final estimate, if he takes time from important work to become better acquainted with the Guest of his heart. An editorial writer in *The Congregationalist* has put it this way:

"You say you are too busy to attend to matters of religion. If you do not say it, you nevertheless believe it. This answer to your friend, or your conscience, is always on the surface of your mind. You do not have to think it up. No one needs to ask you about it. Just as the sign is hung out, 'No peddlers allowed,' so your personality exhibits the sign, 'No religion allowed.' No hard feelings; simply you can't be interrupted. Life is short, time is precious, there is an immense amount to be done. Every unessential interest, and the whole drifting heap of minor matters, has to be snow-plowed off the track of your life. The leisure class who have plenty of time for books and magazines, church and social functions don't understand.

"Suppose you stop long enough to see if *you* understand. There is the danger when one is always on the rush of forgetting something important.

"You have forgotten something vitally important. It is poor business in you to do it. Religion is a necessity of life. It must be provided for as fixed charges are, ahead of everything else. Religion is in the class of sleep and water and food.

"And you have religion, of course. You must have it no

matter how busy you are; only it is a poor kind, that grows in poor soil, gets no water, and is never weeded. Such as it is, you are falling back upon it continually, speaking of it as 'the way I look at it,' or 'my philosophy of life is,' etc. This is your religion—a mixture of fatalism and superstitions and worldly wisdom, with traces of gospel goodness. It is generally unlovely, and often hard. It brings you little satisfaction and in times of trouble it leaves you a stranger to peace."

THIS IS THE AGE OF ORGANIZATION. WE HEAR MEN SPEAKING of the number of societies, clubs, boards, and committees they belong to as though this were the measure of their worth. It is also the age of superficial and abortive effort in many things. After all, nothing can replace personality when it comes to solid and enduring achievement. Yet we have come to look to the institution rather than the leader, to the committee rather than the man. Here is an utterance of Bishop J. F. Berry that will find hearty approval from multitudes of organization-buried souls. He says, in *The Christian Advocate*:

"Not much can be done until we have a president, vice-president, a secretary and an executive committee. Then the thing we desire to do must be moved and seconded, and referred, and amended, and substituted, and officially authorized by a formal vote. Still further, a committee must be appointed to carry out the mandate of the chief body. Machinery, machinery, machinery! Wheels and cogs, and pulleys, and levers, and lathes, and magnetos, and dynamos, and cylinders, and cylinder-rods, and cyclometers galore! How constitutions and by-laws and parliamentary rules have taken possession of us! How personality has been absorbed by the machine!"

ONE SOMETIMES WONDERS HOW MANY OF US ARE SIMPLY IMITATORS. It is so extremely easy, especially when young, to be fascinated by what appears to be a brilliant trait or manner in another that one tries to make these things his own by copying them. But there is a great distinction between adopting a worthy characteristic seen in another, and trying to wear another's nature. The former is one way of building up one's own personality, while the latter either makes one ridiculous, or

at best produces a poor imitation of some one else. Let every one be himself.

Mr. Loyd Scruggs who began life as a boy in a Kentucky mountain village, but has come to be a successful business man, deals with this very mistake, when he tells in *The American Magazine* of his own blunder at this point:

"Before I went into business I had somehow formed an exaggerated idea of what a business man ought to be like. Consequently, I tried to look and act as dignified as some of the men I thought were worth emulating; but I made a miserable failure of it.

"See here," I said to myself at last, 'I can't be a regulation business man, so I'm going to be just Scruggs.'

"I learned that it did not pay to set myself up to be anybody but myself. I not only made a wretched failure of trying to be the other fellow, but I also missed the chance of being myself. People were interested only in knowing what I *was*; not in what I thought I would *like* to be.

"From that I concluded that one of the best ways to be different is just to be yourself. I am not very much afraid of competitors who try to copy our methods."

BOOKS

THE ORIGIN OF PAUL'S RELIGION ¹

Professor Machen has written a notable volume. Whether measured by literary standards or by standards of scholarship, it is a book to be reckoned with. It is safe to predict that it will take rank speedily among the weighty contributions to the critical literature of the New Testament.

Despite its serious and scholarly character, the volume has a literary quality that is as refreshing as a cool breeze. As a rule one does not expect to find a book dealing with critical matters particularly readable. In fact, many predecessors of this volume have come from the pen of Professor Dryasdust.

¹ *The Origin of Paul's Religion*, by J. Gresham Machen, James Sprunt Lectures at Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Virginia. New York, 1921. Pp. 329.

Macaulay was one of the first of modern historians who showed that history could be written in an interesting vein, however profound it might be. We hail the Princeton Professor as one who does not regard it as a crime to be interesting in the study of abstruse problems of Biblical criticism. One finds himself fairly fascinated in delving into questions that lie between the lines in the Acts or the Epistles. A less skillful leader might have given us lagging feet and drooping imagination in such intimate studies. As a matter of fact the New Testament is ever the most interesting of books, and only a dull writer can make it otherwise. It is easy to imagine a responsive mind sitting up late with this volume, rejoicing like one who has found great spoil, and awaking in the morning with fresh gratitude for a clear, comprehensive, and masterly pen in the service of the Word of God.

The reviewer is tempted to spend time over minor felicities of the book, such as the crystalline clearness of the explanations of points of view, and the oftentimes sudden illuminations of texts and passages of the Scripture. The author has a way of puncturing swollen and important theories with sudden pricks of reality, like the masterly, if old-fashioned, surgeon of childhood's days, who had his sharp tool at the bottom of our virulent sore spots, ere the patient had time to writhe or cry out. Examples of this quick surgery are found in the brief treatment of "adoptionist Christology" and "kenosis" (p. 118). An example of textual illumination—there are many such—is found on page 46. When Paul declares himself to be "an Hebrew of the Hebrews," he contradicts in advance all the modern representatives who make Paul the Apostle fundamentally a Jew of the Dispersion. The author is a ready match for those pettifogging higher critics who hang too heavy weights on phrases and words. Quite irresistibly perhaps, he himself yields occasionally to the same contagion of minutiae. It is worth while to see such mighty protagonists of criticism as Baur being driven into a corner by an American blade. As to Wrede, Bousset, and Brückner, they receive little mercy at the hands of the constructive scholarship of this volume.

Yet the author is fair even to the point of conceding many things to the critics. He possesses the first element of strength for a strong fighter, in that he respects the weapons of his opponent. He has no indiscriminate denunciation for the work of higher criticism. He demands nevertheless that the critics shall defend themselves, and show adequate reason for their destructive views. There are revealing phrases and clauses, such as "modern pantheizing liberalism" (p. 198), and "lordly disregard of dates" (p. 241), that emphasize the murky light in which higher criticism often moves. If any critic who has essayed to discuss New Testament literature is caught making undue assumptions as to text or fact, the author has him quickly on the hip.

I admire very much, too, the apt way in which Professor Machen has interpreted historic situations by swift frescoes of language. I do not remember to have understood so well until now the decadence, both intellectual and spiritual, of the Hellenistic age. The phrase, "failure of nerve," which the author borrows from another, seems to state the nature of the decay in a flash. That the desire for redemption born of the weakness of the Hellenistic period cannot account for the deep redemptionism of the Pauline Gospel, is shown by the fact that it was not full-born until the second century after Christ. Even apart from this difficulty of dates, the inchoate humanism of the Hellenistic age is altogether insufficient to account for the rich and joyous humanism of the Gospel founded upon the grace of God.

One watches the critics at their fencing with fascinated mind, and not infrequently does it turn out that the Princeton Professor has left the giants in the field with weapons on the ground. The process is not to the taste of every kind of reader, but one who knows what has been done to the Bible by the crassest kind of naturalistic criticism cannot but feel the glee of Israel's host when David's smooth stone from the brook did execution with Goliath. These same Goliaths, indeed, have so long held sway—some of them have swaggered not a little—that a doughty defender of the things spoken of in the

churches is to-day more than ever welcome. It is not to be doubted that some of the older critics, if they could live again, would regard him as a worthy antagonist, with whom they would delight to cross swords. No weapon is neglected that the critics themselves in past time have found useful. With the utmost skill and courage our author turns their own weapons against them. The only exception is that he is never anti-supernatural. It is a profound conviction with him that naturalistic theories of Christianity and of the Christian Scripture are wholly inadequate. He meets the naturalistic critic on his own ground with the utmost candor, appreciation, and acuteness of understanding, yet with a saving reverence and supernaturalism of feeling that show his constructive purpose. Occasionally one hears it said that scholarship is all enlisted in the reconstruction of the Bible on naturalistic lines. Not with this volume added to the material of conservative believers in the Word of God.

All this is not to say that our author is always to be praised. The wheels drag heavily with him at times. One has impressions here and there that he is laboring his points, as critics of all schools are likely to do. The lengthy discussion about "another Jesus" (p. 132f.) is wearisome and not convincing. However, it is Greek meeting Greek. This is the way of the critic. I am not sure, either, that our author does not at times seem to press his claims for the independence of Paul too far. Is it an absolute necessity to prove that the whole of Paulinism is derived in all its intimate particulars from Jesus and the leaders of the New Testament church? The author himself re-creates in a very masterly way the atmosphere in which the Apostle did his work. May we not suppose, without marring the integrity of the Pauline Gospel, that so sensitive a soul as that of Paul was deeply affected by the spirit of his times? Professor Machen's zeal seems at times to carry him beyond the mark in this matter. The reading of the book disturbs a little the long-cherished feeling I have had, a well-founded feeling, that the Apostle was one who could absorb

some elements of world-thought without endangering the Gospel he had received.

These slight negations aside, it is heartening to be carried along in the stream of the argument. The critics who have dealt severe blows at the genuineness of the Pauline Gospel, and the dependableness of Acts and certain of the Epistles, are brought to book by a master hand. Steadily, irresistibly, the argument for the profoundest of all origins for Paul's religion, in the heart of the supernatural Jesus of the New Testament, is carried to its conclusion. With minute care other extraneous sources are examined. The records, too, are carefully studied, with the view of validating the Apostle's independence of serious outside influences. The critical comments on disputed passages in the Acts, the Epistle to the Galatians, and elsewhere are minutely considered.

Professor Machen justly assesses the importance of the problem which he undertakes. It is not merely the origin of Paul's religion, or of Paulinism, that is under examination. It is the origin of Christianity itself, and the validity of the Christian experience which has flowed from a particular view of its origin, that are at stake. If other influences than that of Jesus Himself and His apostles had any large and formative power in shaping the religion of Paul, he is to that extent discredited. Not only so, but the very foundations of Christianity are weakened. Christianity could not part with the Apostle Paul. Hence the anxiety of the present author to define and defend his sources. The body of the work is devoted to showing that the origins could not have been, either in pre-Christian Jewish doctrine of the Messiah, or in the syncretistic pagan religion of the Hellenistic age. The only other alternative is the historical Jesus.

The importance of Professor Machen's work cannot be too highly estimated. With sound scholarship, broad sympathy, and clear insight, he has made more reasonable than ever the sense of certainty which the church has always cherished as respects the Apostle Paul.

EDGAR WHITAKER WORK.

FERRERO²

A curious book this, or rather an essay and an appeal expanded into a book. That the readers of *THE BIBLICAL REVIEW* might be inclined to learn of this treatise, may be presumed, for during a period of more than five years the *Contact and Conflict of Classic Paganism with Christianity* has been presented to them in a series of monographs now tapering to conclusion.

To be fair both to our readers and to the Italian journalist, a few things must be premised. Ferrero as a young man (he was born in 1872) was a reporter of criminal cases, an experience which he soon utilized in sociological feuilleton-work and spicy authorship. (Ferrero, of Hebrew ancestry or birth, so I have been informed, is also a son-in-law of Cesare Lombroso, and jointly with the latter brought out a criminological book in which among other exhibits the skull of Charlotte Corday is presented, as predetermining, somehow, her killing of Marat). Early, too, he developed the journalist's faculty to arrest his readers by catchy or quasi-sensational titles, or summaries. Closely bound up with this was (and is) a veritable audacity in penning generalizations of most unbounded and sweeping measure. To do this constantly and fearlessly is one of the necessary tools of your sociological publicist.

The fall of the three great dynasties of Europe and the general débâcle of most of her states, he argues, have destroyed or annihilated in them the *very principle of authority*, whether moral or political, nor has democracy (p. 203) a better anchor to-day in the souls of men there except, he claims, in England, Switzerland or France, (the United States). Anarchy otherwise everywhere. He does not except his own country, Italy. The whole wretched and doleful state of civilization to-day, he urges, is (by way of parallel) found in the Roman Empire after Septimius Severus, or after Claudius Gothicus (d. 270 A.D.)

The tetrarchy of Diocletian and his other tentative devices did not really restore unity or authority. Constantine adopted

² *The Ruin of the Ancient Civilization and the Triumph of Christianity*, by Guglielmo Ferrero, translated by Hon. Lady Whitehead. New York and London, 1921. Pp. VII + 210.

Christianity as a conservative device and for the unification of the Empire; likewise he essayed a Constantinian new capital and a dynasty. All this failed to restore unity or authority, or to arrest the irresistible process of disintegration. *As then, so now*; this is the gist of the essay, or treatise, of Signor Ferrero.

Of the earlier work of Ferrero I wrote in a careful critique (*American Journal of Philology*, 1914, vol. 35, p. 381): "I must however, say, and say it with the utmost deliberateness, that, as regards the assurance of unsupported affirmation, the setting aside of the results of examination and sifting and weighing made by a series of eminent minds and infinitely painstaking observers, as regards the beribboning and tricking out of many bare spots in the actual tradition with a meretricious make-believe of clear lines, bright pigments and a positive *haut-relief* of figures—in all these respects, I say, I must write it down here, that I have never read a more pretentious work."

Mutatis mutandis, that judgment is applicable to the present treatise as well. One would think that Gibbon had really settled many if not most of the historical problems, nay obscurities, connected with, or overlying, that period of the decline of the Roman Empire. I spent rather more than five years in a close and exhaustive study of the original sources for that period, say from the death of Marcus Aurelius to Alaric's sack of Rome, 180-410 A.D. Elementary honesty and veracity compel me to attest the marvelous and exhaustive scholarship of the British historian, though the deist's sneer at revealed religion is everywhere in evidence. Signor Ferrero does not once mention Edward Gibbon. Mommsen, whose little finger is more weighty than the loins of ten Ferreros, is mentioned once in a make-believe critical allusion. Gregorovius is not named.

I turn to a number of concrete points, some dealing with the Roman Empire, some with the Christian church. The Italian journalist's apparent darling ambition continually is this: To present new valuations, or to depreciate those seemingly long established. So here he endows the Senate of Rome in the imperial era, up to Septimius Severus (193 A.D.), with

a very positive political power, reiterating this fanciful Ferreresque thesis over and over again. I may cite Gibbon, chapter 3: "To resume, in a few words, the system of the Imperial government, as it was instituted by Augustus, and maintained by those princes who understood their own interest and that of the people, *it may be defined as an absolute monarchy disguised by the forms of a commonwealth*. The masters of the Roman world surrounded their throne with darkness, concealed the irresistible strength, and humbly professed themselves the accountable ministers of the senate whose supreme decrees *they dictated and obeyed*" (italics mine). So Gibbon. But every scholar knows that the Roman *princeps* almost entirely controlled the *purse* and absolutely alone controlled the *sword*, whether in the praetorium established hard by the northeast wall of Rome (a measure of Tiberius) or in the vast frontier dominions, whether on the Euphrates or in southern Scotland. Ferrero's *ipse dixit* carries no weight with genuine students or scholars. Why should it? Why with the general public?

Another fancy of Ferrero is "the almost total disappearance of the antique civilization" (p. 31). Is he familiar with Comparetti's volume on Vergil in the *medio evo*? The history of letters absolutely disposes of this empty generalization. In secular or profane works, quite apart from the jurists, such as Papinian, Ulpian, Julian, Modestus, the civil law itself and its well regulated procedure spread everywhere; the Christian and the Pagan imbibed precisely the same culture whether in Burdigala (Bordeaux) or Carthage or Milan, or Treves or Antioch. When the Emperor Julian the Apostate was in his short power (361-363) he decreed that Christians should not be permitted to teach the Greek and Latin classics. Why? Because these were in themselves the universal culture of men, even then. Is Ferrero familiar with Julian's writings (they are in Greek, it is true), or with those of Julian's spiritual and cultural master, Libanius of Antioch? The Greek classics and Plato, Plotinus and his school, were a mighty power even after the Nicene Council, 325 A.D. Olympian, Nemean, Isthmian Delphian games were still periodically held as of old, after

Constantine, and when his neopagan nephew started on his fatal campaign (363 A.D.) down and beyond the Euphrates.

If Ferrero somehow came to know with any thoroughness (or even with that superficiality which critics and scholars have often brought home to him) authors like Ausonius, Prudentius, Arnobius, Lactantius (whom he mentions once or twice), let alone Jerome, Symmachus, Macrobius, Servius, Claudian, he would run a red pencil through most of his specious treatise. But it matters not, provided his manner be impressive or entertaining. Ambrose, who delivered the funeral discourse on the Emperor Theodosius (who died of dropsy) at Milan, early in 395—his writings are permeated with Vergilian phrase or Vergilian reminiscences. Marius Victorinus, the professor, at Rome, of the Dalmatian Jerome, even earned a statue in that capital during his lifetime. A hundred years before, in the era of Diocletian, Arnobius of Sicca in Numidia, who had been a pagan, evidently carried his cultural and professional equipment into his Christian and later period and was far from limiting himself, henceforward, to the study of the Christian Scriptures. “Arnobius knew well Plato’s *Phaedrus*, *Theaetetus*, *Republic*, *Timaeus*, *Phaedo*, *Meno*, no less than Epicurus and his Latin disciple Lucretius, also Epictetus the Stoic preacher of Nicopolis” (In the Era of Diocletian, BIBLICAL REVIEW, vol. V, p. 260). Or turn to the leaves of Jerome’s *Catalogus* or of Eusebius’ *Praeparatio Evangelica*, not to speak of Origen and the Christian library of Pamphilus at Caesarea. In the era of Theodosius and Ambrose, Servius, the noted grammaticus of Rome, in his commentary on Vergil cites not only Lucan, Statius, Pacuvius, Accius, Ennius, Lucretius, Sallust, Horace, over and over again, but also Cicero in most of his vast production, Ovid (only the *Metamorphoses*, his erotic verse being justly banished from schools), Cato, Plautus, Terence, Juvenal, Lucilius, and almost more than any of them Varro, the great antiquarian of Cicero’s time—Varro, studied no less by the old believers of Rome than by the protagonists of Christianity, such as Augustine himself. Homer, too, is cited very frequently, more rarely we meet names like Pindar, Euripides, Herodotus,

Thucydides, Sophocles, and others. The libraries of Rome were many before Alaric, and well stocked.

Turn we now to a few points of Christian history as handled by Ferrero. In the latter part of his treatise (158 *sqq.*) he deals with Arius and Athanasius, with the great Council of Nice (325 A.D.) and its final formulation of Christology. Hosius of Cordova (not Osius, p. 162) presided, taking precedence over the legates of the Bishop of Rome, the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, and over the Primate of the whole African church (Cox Morse, in Dictionary of Christian Biography, s.v. Hosius, vol. III, p. 168). On this point, however, there is controversy. But it is quite possible, if not probable, that the Emperor chose him for that very thing. We must not here trace that Council's work, nor the subsequent and consequent struggle of Athanasius and Arianism which so gravely shook and disrupted the Christian church. We limit ourselves to a citation from the text of the Italian journalist, with little comment of our own.

"To modern men [all of them collectively labeled and stamped by Ferrero, as a unit, of course], as to Constantine, these theological disputes which played such a great part in the history of Christianity, seem an almost inconceivable folly. How was it that all the force and wisdom of the Imperial authority were powerless against what seems to us [which "us"] a kind of delirium?"

How grotesquely naïve, this pronouncement! The person of Christ, central element in Christian theology, in Christian faith, hope, and life, is, of course, consummately indifferent to Ferrero; therefore it must be to all modern men, whose spiritual mouthpiece he claims to be.

He has read Augustine's Confessions, or in them. Ferrero's presentation of education in that era (p. 170 f.) is superficial, nay, grossly incorrect to a degree. The *Cassiciacum* of Augustine's friend near Milan was a farm and vineyard, no "village" (172). Now, not the Confessions of the Bishop of Hippo, but his *De Civitate Dei* was the veritable swan's song of expiring paganism and of that which we may call ancient

civilization, and would have furnished to Ferrero incomparably more material for his general thesis than anything he adduces in this hurried treatise.

E. G. SIHLER.

CHRISTIAN UNITY³

Another timely study has been issued by the Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook. Whether one agrees or disagrees with such reports in their total attitude or in their detailed statements, one cannot fail to recognize that the consensus of opinion presented is representative of the leadership of a large part of the American Protestant forces of to-day. The chief characteristics of the present volume are its crystalline clearness of statement, its impartiality in describing the present status of the question of unity in the various branches of the church, its judicious appraisal of the many attempts being made toward unity in different quarters, and its dispassionate presentation of the historical background without which there is no possible understanding of the present denominational confusions.

Most of the ground covered is familiar territory to those who have thought much on the subject. But the putting of a question so pregnant with controversy in such a clear light is certainly to be welcomed. Doubtless the Christian public is not so well informed as the leaders in the movement toward church unity often assume, and this fact may explain the reluctance so often seen to follow their leadership. Unless a large part of the material of this book is the familiar knowledge of the average layman as well as of the ecclesiastical statesman, we will not get very far. For, to the one the problem often seems so simple that opposition is rated merely as cantankerousness, and to the other the difficulty appears so insurmountable that there is a hopelessness about the making of any attempt.

The war was the occasion for the work of the Committee, and the war naturally led to this question of unity. When the

³ Christian Unity. Its Principles and Possibilities, by the Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook. New York, 1921. Pp. XIV + 386.

criticism was made that the Christian church fell down before the task of preventing the war, and functioned very inadequately in meeting the situation developed by the war, those who sought to fix the responsibility came upon the surprising fact that there was no church to be found, only churches. But the real discovery was not so much a lack of unity as a lack of effective organs for the expression of such unity of ideals and desires as the church in all its branches actually possessed. So the task of unity, as the study of this Committee concludes, sifts itself down largely, at least immediately, to the providing of external forms to give effectiveness to the sense of common purpose already actuating numerous bodies of Christians.

The book might well have been subtitled, *A Valuable Aid to Clear Thinking on a Confused Subject*, or, *A Guide-book through the Forest of Denominational Entanglements to the High Ground of Christian Effectiveness*. The Committee proposed to itself, not the planning of a program, but the making of a study, and proceeded on the assumption that the churches need to do some serious thinking and to think together. The result in this book is an evidence of the value of such co-operative thought.

The study falls into three divisions. The present situation of the question of unity in some of the larger denominations is first discussed by competent exponents, who, while not writing authoritatively, are easily recognized as truly representative of the groups for which they speak. The attempts at local co-operation, undenominational movements, the unity already practiced by administrative boards, the promising work of the Federal Council of Churches, and the significance of the World Conference on Faith and Order are all evaluated. One of the best discussions in the whole book is Robert E. Speer's keen analysis of the Interchurch World Movement. He sets forth quite sharply the causes of its failure, but he also very appreciatively assesses its prophetic spirit.

The historic roots, both divisive and unitive, form part two of the study. And the conclusion is that "church unity is a hope to be fulfilled in the future, not an achievement that has

been lost in the past." But in making a comparison of the present with the past, it becomes very evident that, after centuries of effort for unity, the churches are on a different level of negotiation to-day. The desire for alliance or federation is far beyond the stage of friendly recognition, and there is a demand for unity of operation which is both strong and insistent.

The third and briefest section deals with the outlook for the future. No extravagant optimism as to any immediate consummation is voiced, and yet the tone of the discussion is hopeful. Two facts are encouraging: First, there is an irresistible movement toward unity, which is constantly gathering new strength and which already shows definite accomplishments; and, second, there is the growing consciousness on the part of the churches of the terrific pressure of the task that confronts them.

There is a pleasing absence of emphasis upon the merely utilitarian aspects of the question. The doctrinal phases are confined to a plea for a catholicity of thought which will preserve all doctrinal values considered precious to any particular group. Attempts at uniformity which suppress the liberty of the spirit and the diversity of gifts are recognized as provocative of disunion. Unity with diversity is claimed as the only kind desirable or practical.

Underlying the whole discussion is the thought that it is the unity of a common enterprise which is considered. And this form of unity appears not only desirable but indispensable if the Christian church is not to fail of its tremendous responsibilities. The appeal of the non-Christian world, the appalling need of an adequate religious education within Christendom, the problems of developing a more effective evangelism, of Christianizing our social conditions, of permeating our international relations with the Christian spirit—all these with other tasks that are increasingly laying hold of the conscience of the church are challenging it to a degree of united endeavor never yet realized.

One lesson stands out more or less distinctly from the recent

failures of some closely related bodies to effect a definite union when the attempt has been made. It seems as if too much detail of arrangement is made the subject of negotiation before the union contemplated is actually effected. Differences therefore which would naturally arise in any deliberative body and be amicably settled are made points for continued separation. It would appear that where churches agree in principle and general form of organization, a simple plan of union might be adopted, leaving many problems to be worked out patiently and unhurriedly in the light of the new situation.

But the crux of the whole matter lies in the juxtaposition of the local churches and the governing bodies of the denominations. The latter hesitate to unite because they fear their ability to carry the local constituencies, and the individual churches find it difficult to join with their neighbors because of the complications of denominational responsibilities.

The dilemma can be met only when both horns can be grasped at the same time by an overpowering sentiment throughout the whole church which will demand a unity of operation where a unity of purpose exists. For cultivating this sentiment, this book is an important contribution, and should be most widely read.

WILBUR VINCENT MALLALIEU.

SHALL WE STAND BY THE CHURCH? ⁴

Professor Drake's book, which is described by its author by the singularly inept phrase, "a dispassionate inquiry," has aroused somewhat complicated and contradictory emotions in the mind of the reviewer. There is much that is brilliant, earnest, incisive, and worth while in the book, to which any candid reader, whatever his viewpoint, would be anxious to do justice.

On the other hand, the discussion from beginning to end is disfigured, I am compelled to say, by bare-faced, special pleading, by an off-hand and jocular dogmatism which has

⁴ Shall We Stand by the Church? by Durant Drake, A.M., Ph.D. New York, 1920. Pp. 181.

rather the ring of omniscient adolescence, and by an intellectual scorn for those whose views are different from the author's. One can but wonder if the author of this book teaches philosophy in the same exuberant and dogmatic fashion. The only evidence of the reflective mind and judicial temper which is supposed to characterize the teacher of philosophy is exhibited in the plea for such a temper toward the non-Christian religions of the world. I would venture to return to its author, upon the principle of the mote and beam, which he adduces, the advice which he offers to the church:

"If Christianity (liberal as well as other) is ever to deserve to conquer the world, it will only be by giving up its cocksureness, its sense of having all the wisdom on its side, by holding out a hand of fellowship to these others and prevailing over them by its greater reasonableness and its wider sympathy" (p. 160).

This is good advice, heartily commended to the adviser.

As an example of the consistent lack of regard for divergent opinion, I adduce the following, which is chosen because it cannot be suspected of hitting anywhere near my own particular place of abode. After claiming that the truth of Christianity, as he interprets it, is to be established by experience, the seeker "to try both methods, the worldly and the Christian" for himself, he goes on to say:

"A Nietzsche or a Schopenhauer, some over-egotistical or wild-fancied eccentric, and many a hot-blooded youth, may reject the lessons of history and experience, but the normal and mature man cannot but yield his assent to the Christian paradox of renunciation" (p. 91 f.).

I hold no brief for the hot-blooded youth, but I do think that, according to the writer's own principles of allowing due honor even within the church to honest radicals and free-thinkers, these distinguished advocates of negation and revolt have been rather harshly dealt with. I may as well confess that this book has a bad effect upon my mind. Even when it advocates what I like and believe in, I like these opinions less

and believe in them less than before, because of the manner and spirit in which they are advocated.

If Professor Drake will thus treat and reduce to insignificance radicals and free-thinkers of the type just mentioned, it can easily be imagined what fate is dealt out to the "orthodox" (usually held up to public scorn in the pillory of "quotes") and "traditionalists with their tottering theology."

If this is dispassionate discussion I should prefer to stand at a distance when the furnace is really heated. Let me select one of a score of quotable instances. In speaking of Christian apologetical writers in general and without perceptible qualifications, he says:

"Each new writer has a way of his own to escape back from the drift of experience to the traditional beliefs, and all sorts of laborious casuistries and hazy evasions pass current" (p. 65).

I should very much like to see this judgment justified in detail from the writings, say, of Principal Fairbairn, Professor James Denney, and other Christian apologists whom we could name. The author's consummate skill in sneering an opponent out of court is shown in the following:

"It is not necessary to impute dishonesty to these writers. Convinced as they are that their beliefs are true and vitally and immanently important to mankind, it is no wonder that they accept any argument, however flimsy, that seems to sustain them. Who cares to criticize arguments that make for what he intensely believes? To criticize the argument would seem like doubting the belief" (p. 66).

If this is to be construed into a sincere defense of the "honesty" of Christian apologists, it would go far to undermine one's faith in any argument whatever. After very sharply contrasting "open-mindedness" and "orthodoxy," our author goes on to say:

"The very concept 'orthodoxy' is presumptuous and illegitimate. The orthodox doctrine is simply, of course, the opinion of the majority—or rather, the opinion of a few leaders, who were able to stamp their views, by persuasion, or by more questionable methods, upon a particular church. Orthodoxies,

hitherto, have always been mistaken, have always been transient; and wherever the conception of 'orthodoxy' has been entertained, there has been a distinct brake on intellectual progress" (p. 66).

There is a squirming nest of fallacies and half-truths in this statement, which I pass in silence. The student of doctrinal history knows just how true and untrue such an extreme and intemperate statement is. I wish merely to call attention to the utter intolerance shown in this utterance and others like it. The one sufficient answer to all this sort of thing—which sweepingly impugns the intelligence and by more or less loosely veiled innuendo the candor of those who accept the traditional faith—is this: Scores and even hundreds of great men, great scholars and great thinkers, honest, candid, able, fully abreast of the science and history of the day, have believed and advocated with full conviction and consummate ability what Professor Drake dismisses with such scornful depreciation. Moreover, much notable history in the building up of the Kingdom of God has been and is being done by men who believe the things which in this book are thrown overboard as obsolete.

It is also at least open to question whether the beliefs advocated in it would be as successful as the author evidently thinks they will be. So-called "Liberal Christianity" of the type he advocates is no new thing, and it has had considerable opportunity to show what it is good for. What has it done? Mind you, I am not attacking; I am raising a question which has been suggested by this author's apparent utter confidence that he is speaking the last word. I am frank to say that I had thought that such dogmatism had died out of the earth.

There is very little more to be said. It seems to me that the writer of this book has thrown away a great opportunity. Had he approached his task with greater humility and with a deeper sense of responsibility he could not have treated a great subject with such disdainful shallowness. He climbs into a high seat who ventures to advocate the discarding of important elements in the teaching of Jesus (p. 26) and criticize the interpretation of the apostolic age as to the meaning and value

of His Person (p. 28 *et passim*). Such a position ought surely to be taken soberly, discreetly, and in the fear of God.

Professor Drake is a professor of philosophy in Vassar College.

LOUIS MATTHEWS SWEET.

SOURCE BOOK FOR AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY⁵

The laborer in the field of history must have tools wherewith to accomplish the task. It is true that here as elsewhere the possession of the most elaborate assortment of tools of the finest quality does not insure a satisfactory finished product—even in the writing of history it may sometimes come to pass that there is a poor workman who is a discredit to his tools—and yet, history cannot be produced wholly without tools. In general it may be said that the tools of the historian are of two sorts, the historical sources, and the writings of his fellow-craftsmen whose labors have preceded his in the same field. To claim to be a historian without painstaking research into the sources is futile, and to attempt to be a historian while ignoring the results of the research of others is foolish.

Hence it is that Professor Mode has made every student of church history very greatly his debtor through the preparation and publication of his recent book, entitled *Source Book and Bibliographical Guide for American Church History*. A source book and a bibliography in a single volume, and that, too, covering so complicated and so vitally interesting a field as American church history—what a boon!

It would seem that our author is justified in the affirmation of the opening paragraph of his Preface:

“Through the publication of several source collections, much has been done to assist the student of American political, social and economic history. But no corresponding assistance has been given to such as are interested in the more specifically religious history of our nation. It is true of course, that for the colonial period, political history to a considerable degree resolves itself into the religious and that, therefore, the source

⁵ *Source Book and Bibliographical Guide for American Church History*, by Peter G. Mode, A.M., Ph.D. Menasha, Wisconsin, 1921. Pp. XXIV + 735.

books already published contain much material that is serviceable to the church historian. For the national period, however, with its multiplication of church organization, its controversies and divisions, its nation-wide revivals, and its missionary extension at home and abroad, no source material has been assembled for convenient access. Hence the publication of this volume, which within the briefest possible space embodies the most significant documents for the entire field of American church history."

Among the other excellencies of Professor Mode's method in presenting his subject is his exceedingly clear and comprehensive Table of Contents. What amounts to a working syllabus of each chapter is given, and the chapters themselves are arranged after an interestingly logical plan. The scope of the book can be appreciated from the fact that it begins with the earliest colonization of our country and does not close until it has recorded even that which is so recent as "the Constitution adopted at the International Council on Organic Union which met in Philadelphia February 3-6, 1920." And its catholicity is evidenced by the inclusion of chapters on the Mormons, the Jews, the Indians, and the Negro, and bibliographies relating to Christian Science and the Dowie Movement.

The Preface of the book closes in this attractive way: "It only remains to express the hope that through its chapter analysis this work may prove suggestive to instructors in their class-room presentation of American religious history, and that its scientific spirit may have some part in stimulating the interdenominational co-operation that augurs so hopefully for the increasing efficiency of our American churches."

This reviewer has no doubt that the first part of this desire will be abundantly realized—the book should accomplish a very useful mission with all teachers as well as all students of church history—and he most cordially joins Professor Mode in his eagerness that there may also be some contribution to the church history of the future as true interdenominationalism increasingly supplants unchristian sectarianism.

JAMES COFFIN STOUT.

THE BIBLICAL SEMINARY IN NEW YORK

(CHARTERED BY NEW YORK STATE BOARD OF REGENTS)

DR. WILBERT W. WHITE, President

FOUR REGULAR DEPARTMENTS — Department of Theology, three years. Department of Religious Education, three years in religious pedagogy, or two years in Bible teaching. Department of Missions, two years. Department of Post-graduate and Special Study.

The Department of Theology

Curriculum framed with college graduate in mind.

Of the 1,384 required hours in the Department of Theology, 589 are devoted to direct, systematic, progressive Bible Study. In addition to the 1,384 required hours in this Department, 104 hours must be elected, making 1,488 hours in all, the minimum for graduation in the Department of Theology.

A due proportion of correlated studies.

Pastors Department

A new department for pastors has been established, whereby settled pastors may have a month's intensive study of the English Bible at the School. Regular courses by members of the Faculty. Special lectures by prominent speakers. Visits to New York religious and public institutions.

The Department is already meeting a great need in a very effective way. Several hundred pastors have expressed an earnest desire to take the course. Those who have taken it are unanimous and hearty in their endorsement and appreciation of the plan.

The cost of providing room, board, and instruction in the Seminary is \$100 a month. Many congregations are raising a special fund for this purpose. Some individuals have given generously to provide scholarships.

Summer term of four weeks opens on July 5, 1922. Send for literature.

TRAINS MANY MISSIONARIES — This School stands second among American educational institutions of all kinds in number of students entering foreign missionary work. More than one in every twenty American foreign missionaries now on the field have received training here. Special attention to phonetics and missionary linguistics.

A COSMOPOLITAN SCHOOL — Last year 29 denominations, 21 foreign countries, 34 states, 168 universities, colleges, and other institutions of higher learning were represented by the student body of 394. Missionaries present, 92.

In sending for Catalogue, please state the department in which you are especially interested

THE BIBLICAL SEMINARY IN NEW YORK
541 Lexington Avenue

New York